

# The Classical Review

MARCH 1897.

## CONTESTED ETYMOLOGIES.

(Continued from p. 15.)

### V.—ὄβριμος or ὄμβριμος?

§ 1. The spelling ὄμβριμος occurs on a papyrus MS. of the third to fifth century for Iliad Γ 357 (Kenyon's *Classical Texts from Papyri in the Brit. Mus.* 81). MSS. of Pindar and Hesiod also contain it. The form ὄβριμος is preserved on the inscriptions from Pergamon (i. no. 116). W. Schulze (*K.Z.* 33, 368.) regards the μ of this form as parasitic, noting λάμβδα || λάβδα beside Hebrew *lāmed*. He draws after a little argumentation the conclusion: 'erst aus λάβδα ist λάμβδα durch secundäre wucherung entstanden.' Into this conclusion I cannot follow him. It will sufficiently explain the phenomena to regard ὄμβριμος as the original form, with a loss of its first μ by dissimilation.

§ 2. For the solution of this question we must have recourse to etymology. Grassmann (*K.Z.* 12, 91) compared *ambhrā-s*, defined by Böhtlingk 'furchtbar,' by the Nāighantakukāṇḍa 'gross,' and by Sāyana 'fürchterlich schreiend.' Schaper (*K.Z.* 22, 524) writes 'ὄβριμος (βρίμη) robur secum habens,' taking ὄ- as the 'copulative' in the sense of σύν. Curtius (*Grdze.*<sup>5</sup> 532) takes ὄ- as 'prothetic,' and connects with βρι-θω 'be heavy,' etc. There is, however, a difficulty about the quantity of the ι if βρίμης (Hymn. Hom. 28, 10) is a correct emendation, as Hesychius's βρίμη ἀπειλή καὶ γυναικεία ἀρρήτοια seems to declare. That ὄβριμος was however brought into connection with

βριθω and its kin by the Greeks seems to be attested by the variant Ὀβριαρεῖς for βριαρεῖς (*Et. Mag.* 346, 41). Froehde (*B.B.* 8, 162) compared Sk. *ugrā* with ὄβριμος, by a phonetic process that is at least abnormal. Fick (*B.B.* 16, 170) equates ὄβριμος with Sk. *agrimā-s* 'voranstehend,' and this is accepted by Prellwitz (*Et. Wört.* s.v.). I, for one, cannot bring myself to accept an etymology that separates *agrimās* from √aj. 'drive.' Johansson (*I.F.* 3, 239) favours Curtius's explanation.

§ 3. Of all these comparisons that with ὄμβρος<sup>1</sup> 'rain-cloud' and its kin seems to me the best. We have in Homer the explicit phrase ὄβριμον ὕδωρ (Δ 453). Besides, Athena, daughter of Zeus the thunderer, is ὄβριμοπάτρη. The signification is also attested elsewhere, thus Sk. *āmbhas* 'water' beside *ambhī-ṇā* 'fearful, great.' The same meanings appear in Sk. *ugrā* 'mighty' = ἰγρός 'moist.'

§ 4. As to the form, ἰγρός 'moist' has in ἰβρι-ς 'violence' a parallel i-stem; so the Lat. correspondent of ὄμβρος is *imbri-* (gen. plur. *imbri-um*); of such an i-stem ὄμβρι-μος is a derivative. Greek also has in ἄβρομος 'noisy' < \**mbhr-* (*Il.* N, 41) an o-stem in the weak grade as Lat. *imber* is an i-stem in this grade. The form ὄβριμος, if correct for Homer, may also be regarded as a compromise between ὄμβριμος and ἄβρομος.

<sup>1</sup> With β for normal φ because of the nasal: *supra*, III § 3.

## VI.—ὄπατος ETC.: 'COPULATIVE' ὁ.

The 'copulative' ὁ seems to occur with ὄτριχες 'like-haired,' ὄζυγες 'of the same span.' Parallel with ὄζυγες is ὁμόζυγες, and with ὄπατος ὁμοπάτριος with a mate in ὁμομήτριος. From this last we might have by haplology \*ὁμήτριος whence \*ὄπατος; ὄτριχες would have normally lost its rough breathing, and ὄζυγες ὄπατος<sup>1</sup> followed this lead. Such haplology is very common (cf. Wackernagel, *Altind. Gram.* § 241, and the literature there cited). I propose now to point out several cases not yet recognized in Greek.

## VII.—SOME CASES OF HAPLOLALIA.

## (1) ὄμηρος 'hostage.'

§ 1. The old division ὁμηρος (Curtius *Grdze.*<sup>5</sup> p. 340) is still in vogue (Prellwitz, *Et. Wört.* s.v.). This derivation from ὁμη- and ἀραρίσκω can neither be proved nor disproved without the testimony of non-Ionic inscriptions. From ὁμαρῆς ὁμοῦ συμφώνως (Hesychius) ᾱ is not proved. I suggest therefore that we explain from \*ὁμομηρος, connecting with μέρος 'part.' Treaties between equals had hostages on both sides (cf. Caesar, *B. G.* i. 9). Two bands of hostages would be guaranteed to have equal-treatment, or to be of equal-rank, or of equal-number, cf. μέρος 'destiny, rank, part.' We have here, it seems to me a *bahuvrīhi* compound, as the accent shows, cf. ὁμορος 'having the same boundary.' For the division ὁμηρος it is not easy to justify the accent, as in that case we cannot operate with a *bahuvrīhi* compound, and the primary meaning ought to be something like 'compact.'

## (2) ὄμαδος 'din, noisy-company.'

§ 2. Düntzer (*K.Z.* [15, 361]) objected on the score of the accent to a derivation from ὁμός 'together': I note e.g. ὁμαλός. He also criticises Curtius for the derivation from ὁμο + *fað*: Sk. *√vad*-speak, and the last edition of the *Grundzüge* passes it over in silence, save calling it obscure and dividing ὄμαδος (p. 629). Düntzer also denies the likelihood of our having a compound here like ὁμαιμος, and suggests that the word is onomatopoeitic. Prellwitz (*Et. Wört.* s.v.) compares M.H.G. *zummen*, a comparison which is only valid if ὄμαδος be onomatopoeitic, but makes an alternative reference to ὁμος, noting ὁμοκλή, where of course -κλή belongs to καλέω 'call.' I believe myself that the original word was

<sup>1</sup> Or perhaps ὄπατος lost its rough breathing along with its synonym ἀδελφός, where the aspirate of the following syllable played a rôle.

\*ὁμόμαδος, and meant 'having a drinking-bout together.' The word is used in the *Iliad* of a tumultuous assemblage, while in the *Odyssey* the verb ὁμάδην is used always of the suitors and means 'cheer.' The whole circle of ideas is pretty well represented in our word *cheer*. I also note German *rauschen*. As to the form, -μαδος is in Sk. *māda* 'jollity, drunkenness.' We find in Hesychius μαδᾷ ἐκρεῖ followed alphabetically by μαδαλλεῖ τίλλει, ἐσθίει—μαγάλλοντες τίλλοντες, ἐσθιοντες—μαδάρος, etc. Salmassius corrected to μαδαλλεῖ, etc. Now μαδᾷ 'is wet' and μαδαλλεῖ 'eats' vindicate for Greek a root μαδ- 'be drunken, jolly.' Homer uses ὄμαδος and δοῦπος side by side, e.g. I. 573; κ 556: perhaps the spelling γδοῦπος beside δοῦπος caused -μαγδος beside -μαδος.

§ 3. In the light of this suggestion we are able to interpret ὀρνυμαγδός 'din', used by Homer of the confused noises of men in arms, or even of horses and dogs. I would divide the word ὀρν-μαγδός, and regard -μαγδός as a byform of -μαδος in ὁμαδος. We have in Hesychius ὀρνυμάδες and ὀρνυμαγδός of the same meaning as ὀρνυμαγδός, and possibly the original word was ὀρνυμαγδός with a 'skipping' in Homer of the γ. For ὀρνυ- we can cite ὀρνύαναι ἐρεύγεται 'bellow, roar'; in these words there is doubtless original kinship. As I do not myself believe in a two-syllabled gradation, I would not explain ὁ- of ὀρνύανω as due to gradation, but as an assimilation from \*ἐρύγνω (cf. Joh. Schmidt *K.Z.* 32, 344). The ἐ- of these words I take to be of the same nature as in ἐθέλω, that is a fossilized augment ε-. The stem ὀρνυ- is also attested by ὀρνυμος βρονχόμενος 'eating noisily.' On the other hand we can cite for ὀρνυ- ὀρνύεται<sup>2</sup> ἱλακτεῖ 'roars' (Hesychius).

§ 4. If we take ὀρνυμαγδός to have been the etymological form of the word, and ὀρνυμαγδός an abnormal form, then we can explain in still a different way the origin of the Hesychian forms μαγάλλει etc. cited above, viz. as influenced by ὀρνυμαγδός. Either explanation makes a word entity of -μαδος in ὄμαδος and -μαγδός in ὀρνυμαγδός, and so furthers my assumption that ὄμαδος is for \*ὁμόμαδος.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> This I take to be an unaugmented form belonging with ὤρετο 'howled,' whence the augmented long has been adopted for the present ὤρτομαι instead of ὀρτομαι. Of course one can operate with the 'dehustufe' if one chooses, and likes mysteries. It sometimes seems to me more probable that the ὤ- of this verb is the interjection ὦ!

<sup>3</sup> We may indeed charge upon this word the suffixal -αδος of χροῦ-αδος, κέλ-αδος 'noise, din'; perhaps too κορυδός (Hesych. κόρυθος) 'tufted lark' has been affected; ἀρκί-δ 'locust' and πελει-δδ 'wild dove'; μαι-ναδ- 'raving,' μηκᾶδ- 'bleating,' αἰγῖδ-

On the same general lines Sk. *samād-* 'quarrel, battle' is to be referred to *sm* + *mad*.

(3) ἀμύλλα 'prize contest,' ὄμιλος 'assembly.—' ? Lat. *mīlia* 'thousands.'

§ 5. Latin *simultas* seems to help the derivation of ὄμ-αδος and *sam-ād-* from *sam-*, only *simultas* may well be a compound *simul-i-tas* 'going together,' just as *simulter* is used in Plautus for *similiter*; or *simultas* is an *in malum sensum* byform of *similitas*.

§ 6. Misteli (*K.Z.* 17, 177) derives ἀμύλλα from \*ἀμ-ι-γῶ that is ἀμα + ἰλ whence ἰλη 'troop' and compares ὀμιλία, deriving the signification of both from the sense of 'crowding together.'<sup>1</sup> Prellwitz (*Et. Wört.* s.v.) derives ἀμύλλα from *sem-il-ia*, and compares Lat. *similis* 'like'; *simultas* 'enmity.' Lat. *-ilis*, however, should be in Greek *-alos*, if we may judge by χθαμαλός: *humilis*, ὀμαλός: *similis*.

§ 7. I believe, with Misteli (*l.c.*), that ἀμύλλα and ὄμιλος are akin, and suggest their derivation from \*ἀμα-μω-λο- and \*ὄμο-μω-λο- respectively. For σλ > λλ compare χέλλιοι and χίλιοι 'thousand': Sk. (sa-) *hāśra-m*. I refer μω- to Sk. *√mish* which the *Dhātupāṭha* defines by *spardhāyām* 'contends for a prize.' This meaning has not been verified in the literature. We need not for that reason incontinently reject it. It is but a few years since Schroeder verified *√stigh* 'mount' in the *Māitrāyaṇī Saṁhitā*, though the correctness of the *Dhātupāṭha* was all along confirmed by στείχω and Germ. *steigen*. A Greek cognate is μω-θός 'prize-money': Sk. *mīdhā* 'prize, pay, prize-contest.' In Latin I derive *mīles* 'soldier' from \**mīs-l*. Its inflexion is based on *comes*, *eques*, etc. In Greek ὄμ-ιλος means 'troop of soldiers.' I note M 3 οἱ δὲ μάχοντο | Ἀργεῖοι καὶ Τρῶες ὀμιλαδόν<sup>2</sup> 'they fought, Greeks and Trojans, squadron-wise.'

§ 8. An interesting question arises as to the primary meaning of Sk. *√mish*. It means in the *Veda*, in combination with prepositions, 'wink the eyes.' In Brahmapa *√mīl*

'storm-cloud,' ἄμδ- 'strife' show in what various ways this suffix could have extended itself.

<sup>1</sup> To the same group also he joins ἀμύλλα 'sheaf of corn, corn' (*K.Z.* 19, 119), but the smooth breathing and the vocalism contradict this. I would divide ἀμύλλα and refer to ἀλέω 'grind' < \*ἡλέω, Lat. *molo*. For the signification note Lat. *grānum* 'corn': Sk. *jīr-ṇā* 'ground.'

<sup>2</sup> After Homer ἰαδόν takes the place of ὀμιλαδόν. Perhaps we have here a false division; ὄμ-ευνέτης: εἰνέτης = ὄμ-εστιος: ἐστιος = ὄμ-ιαδόν: ἰαδόν. For further examples of such divisions see below § 14. This explanation would relieve the difficulty of the vocalism in connecting ἰλη 'squadron' with εἰλλω (Aeolic εἰλεω, Doric εἰλέω) < \**Feγω*.

occurs in the same sense. I take *mīl-* to be an extension of *mish-* (< *mīsh-*, cf. v. Bradke *K.Z.* 28, 298 and Johannson *I.F.* 2, 49), but, as many persons shut their eyes in smiling, it may be that *mīl-* is for *smīl-*: Eng. *smile*. Besides the meaning 'contend for a prize' the *Dhātupāṭha* defines *√mish* by 'besprengen' (cf. Kern, *I.F.* 4, 112). In Greek μαινώ 'pollute, besmear' we probably have the same root; μίνθος 'dung' may be for \*μίνθος < μω-ν-θος (cf. ἐννυμι < \**Feo-ννμι*), but μίνθος may be from *√mingh-*, with a 'velar' alongside of the palatal form *migh-* (cf. Sk. *megh-ā-s* 'cloud'); perhaps also in μω-γω there is a contamination of μω- and μγ-. A root *mīs* seems abundantly warranted also for Dutch dialects (cf. Kern, *l.c.*). In classical Sanskrit appears *√mīl* 'combine,' Taking Sanskrit alone, all these meanings can be derived from the sense 'put-together, mix.' It is a simple assumption that *mel-ayati* 'he puts together' is in point of formation a causative from *√mīl* (cf. *hodayati* from *√hīd*), specialized in meaning and subsequently begetting *√mīl* 'combine' which is not found till after the Epic and Kalidasa, and is said also to be lacking in the *Dhātupāṭha* (cf. Böhtlingk, s.v.).

§ 9. For *mīlia* 'thousands' a connection is still made with ὄμιλος and Sk. *√mīl* and its kin (cf. Johannson *I.F.* 2, 34). Prellwitz connects with μάλα 'very' (*Et. Wört.*, s.v.). Still another theory connects with μύριοι (L. Havet, *Mém. Soc. Ling.* 3, 415, Thurneysen, *K.Z.* 30, 353). There is objection to the phonetics of the third explanation; the second is possible, but scarcely probable, and the drift of meaning is but vague. As to the first any comparison with the late Sanskrit root *mīl* is out of the question, for *√mīl* is doubtless a special formation (cf. supra, and Böhtlingk u. Roth, s.v.). Stokes cites (Fick's *Wört.* ii. s.v. *mēlo*) Buddhistic *mela* 'an indefinite number,' the authority for which is Vyutpatti's *Sanskrit-Thaietan Lexicon*. Inasmuch as *vela* occurs on the same page, with the same definition, and *m* and *v* constantly interchange in Sanskrit manuscripts who shall say which of these forms is genuine? It were very venturesome to suggest that this special Buddhistic sense of a late Sanskrit word has any place in the inherited stock of the language. I have just pleaded for an Aryan root *mish-* 'put together,' and *mīlia* could be referred to that for its signification in a vague sort of way. But in ὄμ-ιλος it is from the ὄ- that we must derive the notion of 'troop.' Thus neither in Greek

nor Sanskrit does any early cognate of *Jmīṣ* imply a number. Therefore the first explanation seems to me untenable.

§ 10. There is a fourth explanation proposed by myself (*Am. Jr. Phil.* 13, 226), that derives *mīlia*<sup>1</sup> from *sm* + *hīlia* 'one thousand': χέλλιοι, χίλιοι 'thousand' and Sk. *śahasram* 'one thousand.' This explanation has been accepted by Clark (*Manual of Linguistics*, v. index) and Bennett (Appendix to his *Latin Grammar*, § 183, 16) regards it the most probable. Giles (*Manual of Comp. Philology* § 425) calls my explanation 'ingenious but not very plausible.' Lindsay (*Latin Language*, p. 420) thinks it worth reporting [in brackets], but does not accept it. His own suggestion is to set up for Celtic and Latin a separate word for thousand. But every one admits that OIr. *mīle*<sup>2</sup> may be a loan-word from the Latin (cf. e.g. Brugmann *Gr.* ii. § 181, and Stokes *l.c.*). No one, I take it, can deny the plausibility of equating *\*(h)īlia* with χίλιοι, save in gender. Because of *semel* (which may as well be for Aryan *sem*- as for *smm*-), one may say that the Latin form should be *\*semīlia*. The question is not, I am aware, one of Aryan phonetics, or a citation of Sk. *smād* 'unā' would suffice to settle it. The question rather is whether Aryan *\*sem* *\*ghēs-ro*- 'one thousand' may not have become in Italic *\*sm(h)īlia* as well as in Indiranian it became *\*smhāsra-m* 'thousand.' To answer this question conclusively in the negative is at least as hard as to do so in the affirmative. If, as is claimed, Lucilius does not write original *ī* as *ei*,<sup>3</sup> still his *meīlia*, so far from invalidating my explanation from *\*hezlia* > *\*hēlia*, and, by assimilation, *\*hīlia* (cf. *filius* for *fēlius*) does make against the comparison with *δ-μῖλος* where the *ī* is original. My explanation certainly has the advantage of every other so far as signification is concerned, and cannot be refused on the score of any express law of phonetics.

(4) *aquila* 'eagle,' *aquilo* 'north-wind.'

§ 11. Pauli (*K.Z.* 18, 28) connects *aquila* with *aqui-penser* (for *acipenser*) 'sturgeon,'

<sup>1</sup> I note here from Thurneysen (*K.Z.* 30, 353): (Für *mīlia*) 'aber auch Lucilius (ed. L. Müller ix. 21) die schreibung mit *ei* verlangt, der offenes und geschlossenes *i* sonst noch richtig scheidet.' Lucilius's simple and childlike rule, however, seems to have been to use *ī* for singulars and *ei* for plurals (cf. Lindsay, *Lat. Lang.* p. 9)!

<sup>2</sup> According to Stokes, *BB.* 11, 171, the Celtic inflection shows a fem. *ia* stem. In Latin the neuter prevailed while χίλιοι is of all genders. In Latin *mīle* is a singular to *mīlia*, based on *omne, omnia*: thus the original *io*-stem became an *i*-stem.

<sup>3</sup> See the last foot-note but one on the worth of Lucilius's distinction!

and with *acus* sharp. Fick (*ib.* 19, 257) defines *aquilo* as 'der dunkles wetter bringende.' He compares O. Pruss. *aglo* 'rain' and Lith. *āklas* 'blind.' He further compares *ἀκαρον*-*τυφλόν* (Hesych.), and *ἀχλὺς* 'cloud, darkness'; *aquila* is the black-eagle, *μελανάετος*. Fick's explanation still obtains, and is strong in point of the signification, chiefly because of the adjective *aquilus* 'dusky.' From the point of view of Latin alone all these words may be haplologic, *aquila* < *\*āquiquela* 'dwelling in the clouds,' cf. *inquilinus* (< *\*enquelinus*, v. Lindsay, *l.c.* p. 229), *incola* 'inhabitant': note also *ἐν νεφέλαισιν αἰετός* (Ar. *Eq.* 1013), and the epithet *ὑψητερής* 'high-flying'; *aquilo* < *\*āquiquelon*- 'cloud-driving,' cf. *αἰ-πόλος* 'goat herd,' Lat. *ū-pilio* 'shep-herd'; whereas *aquilus* 'water-bringing' may have been an epithet of the dark cloud. If Fick's comparison with O. Pruss. *aglo* and Lith. *āklas* were correct we should probably expect in Latin *aculus*, cf. *torculus*: *torqueo*, and *coculus*: *coquo*. In regard to the definition of *aqua* by 'cloud' I note *imber* 'rain-cloud, rain.' The rôle of the eagle as *armiger Iovis* makes for the connection with the storm.

§ 12. For the signification I note the words *αἰετός* 'eagle' and *Αἰόλος* 'god of the winds' which are also probably cognate with each other, cf. *αἶθηρ* 'air,' *ἀήτης* 'wind,' *ἀελλα* 'storm': *ἀήμι* 'blow.' Hesychius gives us *αἰβητός*, cf. Doric *αἰβηρ*. A reason for *ai-* and not *a-* is to be sought. There may have been association with *αἰθήρ* and its kin (cf. τ 540; δ δ' [αἰετός] ἐς αἰθέρα διαν αἰεθῆν, and O 690 αἰετός αἰθῶν 'the gleaming eagle'), or the Homeric doublet *αἰεῖ* || *αἰεί* 'always' had influence, for the old age of the eagle seems to have been proverbial (cf. Terence, *Heauton*, 521, where the proverb probably proceeds from a Greek source). In Hesychius we have the two glosses *ἀήτης* *ἀνεμος*, and *αἰθῆρ* *ἀνεμοί*.

(5) *ὁμηλιε* 'contemporary.'

§ 13. The current division is *ὁμηλιε*. Savelsberg (*K.Z.* 8, 406) brings forward *ὁμηλιε* from the appendix of the anthology and cites *βαλκιώτης* *συνέφηβος*, *Κρήτης* (Hesychius). He derives from a 'relative' stem *\*Fo-*. Prellwitz (*Et. Wört.* s.v.) refers *ἡλιε*, Doric *ἄλιε* to the relative stem *γᾱ-*. We are not told why the feminine stem is used, however, in forming the word. I am not able to find that the relative *ἡλίκος* 'as big as, as old as' is ever *ἀλίκος*.

§ 14. It is to be noted that *ἡλιε* and *ὁμηλιε* both mean 'of the same age, contemporary,' and they do not seem to show a trace of a



relative use; besides their noun value is rather harsh if they come from the relative. I propose to divide ὁ-μήλιξ for \*ὁμό-μηλιξ 'having the same age.' I connect \*μηλιξ with Goth. *mel* 'time,' and possibly with Greek μέλλαξ, young man (Hesych. μέλακες). There is difficulty about the vowel however. Theocritus uses ὑμᾶλιξ, and we might then connect with μάλειοι ὅριοι 'boundaries' (Hesych.), and define 'having the same boundaries.' Homer uses the word pre-eminently of young persons, and it is possible that we should connect with μαλακός 'soft' (cf. Aristoph. *Plut.* 1022: μαλακὸν βλέμμα 'youthful looks'). In that case we should compare O. Pruss. *mal-nīks* 'youth' beside *mal-dai* 'young,' noting the Greek doublet *μαλ-ακός* || *μαλθ-ακός* 'young.' I would explain therefore \*ὁμομήλικες (nom. plur.) as \*ὁμομᾶλικες with lengthening of the antepenult as in *ἀνωγνυμος* (*supra*, iv. § 2), by de Saussure's 'loi rythmique.'<sup>1</sup> When ὁμᾶλιξ was arrived at by haplology then a false division was made ὁμ-ᾶλιξ, and -ᾶλιξ abstracted as an independent word in the same sense as ὁμᾶλιξ. This -ᾶλιξ fell in the Ionic dialects under association with ἡλίκος 'as great as,' and took on a rough breathing. False divisions of words in English have been very common, thus *a nadder* has become an *adder* (for numerous examples cf. C. P. G. Scott, *Transac. Am. Phil. Assoc.* 23, 179-; 24, 89-).<sup>2</sup> Note also above (§ 8) ἱλαδὸν by false division of ὁμῖλαδὸν. Hopkins (*Proc. Am. Or. Soc.* 1892, p. clxxvi.) shows that Sk. *āhan* day is almost universally preceded by words with final -d, so that it is an easy assumption that γὰρ *āhar* comes from γὰρ \*dāhar.

<sup>1</sup> Brugmann (*K.Z.* 27, 590) upholds his previous theory (*M.U.* 3, 78-) that σοφώ-τερος is formed analogically from adverb forms like *ἀνώ-τέρω*, say, and denies that a vowel is ever lengthened under this condition. I note the following pairs: *ἐλατός*, 'ductile,' but *ἀν-ήλατος*, 'not ductile'; *ἀνεμος* wind: *ἀν-ήνεμος*; *ἄροτος* 'tillage': *ἀν-ήροτος*; *ὀδύνη* 'pain': *ἀν-ώδυνος*; *ὁμαλός* 'even': *ἀν-ώμαλος* etc. From these examples lengthening in composition spread beyond the limits demanded by the rhythmic law, e.g. *ἀν-ώλεθρος*: *ὀλεθρος*, destruction (Homeric *ἀνώλεθρος*). I see no good ground for an analogy from *ἀνωτέρω* to *σοφώ-τερος*. Why do we not have \**πρωτέρω* and \**πρωτερος*? Brugmann's claim is psychologically erroneous when he says that *σοφώ-τερος*, an original adverbial form, was maintained but not created by the 'loi rythmique.' The Greek who always used *μακρότερος* (— — —) but *σοφώτερος* (— — —) was in fact avoiding four successive shorts, and he could not have done so long without evolving the belief that *ω* in *σοφώ-τερος* was the *ō* of *σοφός* lengthened for a rhythmic purpose.

<sup>2</sup> An interesting example is that of a little boy I knew who said *a gin* (for *again*), and extended that by saying *another gin*.

# (5) The tens in composition.

§ 15. Everybody is agreed that the Aryan word for hundred \**kmtō-* is clipt from \**dekmtō-*. Bugge's explanation (*B.B.* 14, 72) assumes an intermediate form \**dkmtō-*, and amounts to saying that two syllables have been weakened by the one accent of -*tō*. For my own part, this seems utterly unlikely. We may in several ways account for the loss of *de-*.

§ 16. Inasmuch as the stem *-kmtō* is used in composition to form the tens, e.g. *τριάκοντα* 'thirty,' it is possible that there was progressive working of the accent (Kretschmer, *K.Z.* 31, 325), i.e. *τριάκοντα* < \**τρια-δκοντα*, whence \**τριάκκοντα*, if I may use Greek as typical for the Aryan process. This is perhaps the theory of Lindsay (*Lat. Lang.* p. 417) who explains \*(*d*)*kmt* as 'changed in composition.' The same result may be reached in several ways by haplology. Thus, starting from the Gothic doublet *taihun-tēhund* || *taihuntaihund* 'hundred,' there are two current explanations. One (cf. Brugmann, *Gr.* ii. § 179, and V. Henry, *Gr. Com. de l'Angl.* § 122) divides *taihuntēhund* 'δεκάδων δεκάς' 'of tens a ten.' If this was, as Brugmann thinks, the oldest method of counting a hundred, then Aryan \**dekmtōn* *dekmd* may have been shortened to something like \**dekmtōkmd*. The second theory (cf. Kretschmer, *K.Z.* 31, 456) seems to me however more plausible. This divides *taihun-tēhund* 'ten tens,' and regards -*tē* as a lengthened *taī*, cf. O.Norse *-tān* 'teen' (< \**-tāhan*), and Runic *-taunti* (< \**-tāhun*).

§ 17. I propose again to start from a theoretical *twenty*, \**dvī dekmtī* 'two tens' or \**dvīs dekmti* 'twice tens'<sup>3</sup> (cf. *διωχίλοι* 'two thousand'). Assimilation of syllables is an especial feature of the numerals, e.g. Sk. *ṣaṣ*, Lith. *šesz-ì* 'six' (< \**svekš*, cf. Pedersen, *I.F.* 5, 86); Lat. *quinque*, O.Ir. *cóic*, Germ. *fünf* 'five.' In like manner from \**dvīdekmti* we may have had a succession of forms *dvez-dve* > *dvezve* > *vezve*, and, by haplology, *vē* (*ē* being meant for *ē* with compensative lengthening). It is evident we might also start with \**dvīzdvi*, and reach *vī*-. The assimilative processes assumed are unprovable as being located in the primitive period. They do not seem to me more unsubstantial than the arguments on which an Aryan \**wei* 'two' (inferred from Sk. *vi-gu* 'nach beiden seiten,' *vītarā* 'weiter,' *u-bhāu* 'both,' *dvā-ū* 'two,' Brugmann, *Gr.* ii. § 177) is

<sup>3</sup> Ahrens (*K.Z.* 8, 349) writes \**δFιδκατι* as the base of *ἑκατι*.

<sup>4</sup> Johannson (*B.B.* 14, 171) goes even further and assumes *evī* from *ἐέικασι*, as to which v. *infra* § 5

based. The earlier linguists regarded *vi-* in the words for twenty as a byform of *dvī-* (cf. Sonne *K.Z.* 12, 341); so Sk. *viṣu* was for \**dvī-ṣu*, and Sk. *vi*, Lat. *di* 'apart' were various treatments of \**dvī-*. Grassmann (*ib.* 23, 576) thinks that O.E. *vidh* 'with' and Goth. *vithra* 'wieder' disprove this theory. As to the meaning Lat. *cum* and *contra* show precisely the same shift. The Germanic forms prove nothing more than that *v-* alternated with *dv-* in the primitive period. Such an alternation seems also proved by Latin *vi-tricus* 'step-father,' according to Brugmann (*Gr.* ii. § 75) a derivative of the compv. \**vi-tr-*, but possibly for \**vi-pter-icus* 'the second father.' As to the Latin *di-* for *dvī-* it represents Aryan *di-*; note the doublets Sk. *tvē||te*, *soi||roi* (cf. Lindsay, *Lat. Lang.* p. 267). In general it

may be remarked that initial *d-* seems to have been lost even before vowels, as in Germ. *tag*: Sk. *āh-an* 'day' (cf. Noreen, *l.c.* § 57, 3).<sup>1</sup> On the general subject of the treatment of initial *dv-* I refer to Pott, *K.Z.* 26, 152. The whole question in debate resolves to this: a stem *dvī-* 'two' is writ large in all the Aryan languages, and beside it is a sparse representation of *vi-* 'two,' mainly in isolated connections. To maintain that these stems are not to be regarded as cognate byforms is to forbid a man to make any mental projections whatever.<sup>2</sup>

EDWIN W. FAY.

<sup>1</sup> This loss of *d-* was probably due to sentence euphony, cf. Hopkins as cited above § 14.

<sup>2</sup> Fick (*Wörter*, I. s. v. 3 *vā*, and s. v. *viṣu*) does recognize the forms in *dv-* as byforms.

(To be continued.)

#### AGAMEMNONEA.

##### 123. βλαβέντα λουσθίων δρόμων.

Strange that Xenophon *Cyneg.* v. 14 has not been used to explain this much vexed line. Speaking of hares, he there says: οἱ δὲ ἥδη ἔτειοι τάχιστα θέουσι τὸν πρῶτον δρόμον, τοὺς δ' ἄλλους οὐκέτι. So δρόμοι in the plural means one 'run' of a hare divided into several 'spurts.' The πρῶτος δρόμος is the first 'spurt,' after which the hare stops, and then goes on again. προλαμβάνοντες δὲ τὰς κύνας ἐφίστανται . . . καὶ ὅθεν ἂν ἀκούσωσιν ἀποτρέπονται (*Cyn.* v. 19).<sup>1</sup> A hare will, I suppose, do this several times in the course of a run.<sup>2</sup> And in v. 17 Xenophon uses a plural like that of Aeschylus: οἱ δ' ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς τόπους πλανῆται χαλεποὶ πρὸς τοὺς δρόμους, cp. vi. 19. Thus βλαβέντα λουσθίων δρόμων signifies *caught in the last spurt* or *else stopped from the remaining spurts*.

The same sentence of Xenophon is otherwise interesting in connexion with Aeschylus. τὰ μὲν οὖν λίαν νεογὰ οἱ φιλοκυνηγέται ἀφῴσι τῇ θεῷ (Artemis of course). The young of hares were thus especially sacred to Artemis and this gives stronger meaning to 'the omen of the eagles, αὐτότοκον πρὸ λόχου μογέραν πτάκα θομόνοισιν' στυγὴ δὲ δείπνον αἰετῶν.

'The difficulty is,' says Mr. Sidgwick presently, 'why should Artemis ask for the

accomplishment of the cruelty which she hates?' What Artemis hates is the slaying of the young hares; that is done already by the eagles and she does not ask for any more of it. But *because* she hates it, the sign of the eagles is interpreted to signify her anger towards the Atridae. She does not hate the cruelty of killing Iphigenia; whether she ought or not, whatever puzzle it may have been to the devout Aeschylus, she does not. Quite the contrary. The omen means two things and only two. First that Troy will fall after a long siege, the hare and her young somehow meaning apparently the ten years exactly as the omen in the second book of the *Iliad*—the sparrow and her young—means them. Secondly that Artemis is angry with the Atridae. *Why* Aeschylus does not say, but Sophocles will tell us if we want to know.

Thus the eagles and hares are an improvement on the serpent and birds of the *Iliad*, because they have the same meaning and another besides, whether Aeschylus invented it or, as is more probable, some other poet between him and Homer.

However τούτων αἰεὶ ξύμβολα κρᾶναι; this means, I take it, that she demands fulfilment of what tallies (Verrall) with the sign. And the sign means that Troy will fall at last, οὐκ μὴ τις ἄγα, etc., 'only I am afraid of the anger of Artemis.' What tallies with this *sign* is the *fact* that if you want Troy to fall you must first appease the

<sup>1</sup> Cp. *Venus and Adonis* 697.

<sup>2</sup> In ix. 10 Xenophon speaks of the τρίτος δρόμος of a deer.

anger of the goddess. How Calchas knew the method of appeasing her does not appear and does not matter; there is nothing about it in the death of the hare and her young.

But here we come upon another difficulty which sorely puzzles the religious poet, as he shows by his digression, 170-193. Why is Agamemnon driven to commit his fearful crime by the gods who will hereafter take vengeance upon him for it? To justify the ways of half-civilized gods to man is no business of mine, but it is worth while to observe that all this strange theology comes straight out of Homer. Odysseus is twice warned most strictly not to touch the kine of the sun, nor to let his crew do so for they will all perish if they do. Yet they are compelled to do so by exactly the same cause as drove Agamemnon to sacrifice his daughter. And it was Zeus himself who set the wind against them and then jumped at the excuse for destroying them. The terrible simplicity with which it is all told by Homer is more impressive than the dark meditations of Aeschylus by almost as much as the starless night of *King Lear* is more awful than the lucid explanations of Milton. However I can have no doubt that the legend was developed by some poet later than Homer with the Odyssean system of divine Machiavellism in his mind, and that Aeschylus finding it an article of faith explained it as best he could by appealing to faith.

This is closely connected with the jealousy of the gods which is so unpleasant a feature of Greek belief. And it is in the *Odyssey* again that the gods first appear in this aspect, (δ 181, ε 119, ψ 211 and I daresay elsewhere). Infinite as is the advance shown by the *Odyssey* upon the *Iliad* in the presentation of the gods as a rule, this stain upon them is here found first; I can only hope that it was not the fault of the divinest of poets and of men.

131. χρόνῳ μὲν ἀγρεῖ Πριάμῳ πόλιν ἄδε κέλευ-  
θος,  
πάντα δὲ πύργων  
κτῆνῃ πρόσθε τὰ δημοπληθῇ  
Μοῖρ' ἀλαπάξει πρὸς τὸ βίαιον  
οἶον μὴ τις ἄγα . . . .

Comparing 1167, ἡ πρόπυργοι θυσίαι πατρὸς πολυκανεῖς βοτῶν, where Cassandra laments the inutility of her father's sacrifices to save Troy, I incline to think πύργων πρόσθε right in spite of the arguments brought against it. In any case μὲν corresponds to οἶον, not to δέ, and I take the meaning to be: 'though you will take Troy,

and though Destiny will violently destroy all the sacrifices of the cattle of the people to defend their walls, yet I fear the wrath of Artemis.' But it were vain to deny that 'Destiny violently destroying the cattle' is a very odd way of describing their useless slaughter in propitiation of the gods. ἀλαπάζω is used simply for 'killing' in Orph. *Lith.* 599.

146. τόσον περ εὐφρων καλά.

The difficulties of this passage are notorious and the corrections innumerable. To me it seems incredible that καλά should stand as the subject for ἀ καλά (the reading, perhaps the conjecture, of an inferior MS.), and still more so that it should be the vocative. Emended it must be somehow. Suppose Aeschylus said κάκαλά? The word ἀκαλός, connected with ἡκα, meant 'peaceful, still' according to the lexicographers; it might well mean 'gentle' with a dative. Corruption to καλά would be simply inevitable, and ἀ καλά may possibly also contain a further genuine relic of the original. Moreover I suspect τερπνὰ in 149 of being a gloss on ἀκαλά for I do not think that θηρῶν ὀβρικάλοισι τερπνὰ is a tolerable piece of versification amid its surroundings.

We have ἀκαλός in connection with Artemis elsewhere, though very likely by pure accident. Hesiod frag. 242 (Rzach): Ὡς ἀκαλὰ προρέων ὡς ἀβρὴ παρθένος εἶσιν. The line is quoted by Steph. Byz. s.v. Παρθένος with the explanation ἐκλήθη ἐκ τοῦ συνεχῶς περὶ αὐτὸν τὴν παρθένον Ἀρτεμιν κνηγετεῖν ἢ διὰ τὸ ἡρεμαῖον καὶ παρθενῶδες τοῦ μέματος.

192. δαυμόνων δὲ πον χάρις βιαίως  
σέλμα σεμνὸν ἡμένων.

I can have no doubt that Mr. Macnaghten's δι' αἰῶς is right with one slight change. The existence of αἰῶς is no more proof of the existence of αἰῶς than Ἀπόλλω is of Ἀπόλλω. And the next word begins with σ. Read then δι' αἰῶ.

880. ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς δ' ὄμμασιν βλάβας ἔχω.

I am astonished not to find βλάβας challenged. If ever there was an inappropriate word, it is this. We could not say 'I have hurts or harms in my eyes,' and yet what else can βλάβας mean? Nor do I wish to follow Dr. Verrall in reading κλάβας with the best MS. here available. What Aeschylus must have written under the circum-

stances, if he used the *mot propre* at all, would be γλάμας or some word like it—I take γλάμας as the nearest word of the kind to the readings of the MSS. It would by a common corruption become γλάβας, from whence *might* come both our readings. Compare Plautus *Cure.* 317: *os amarum* MSS., *gramarum* Bücheler.

1180. ὥστε κύματος δίκην  
κλύζειν πρὸς αἰγὰς τοῦδε πήματος πολὺ  
μεῖζον.

κλύειν MSS., κλύζειν Auratus, an unsatisfactory change generally accepted. κλύζειν πήμα might mean 'to wash away an evil,' but could not mean 'to roll it onward.' ἄλλειν is all but as near the MSS. after all, and is the word we want.

1321. ἅπαξ ἔτ' εἰπὲν ῥῆσιν ἢ θρήνον θέλω  
ἐμὸν τὸν αὐτῆς.

Professor Housman's ἡρθνῆς for ῥῆσιν ἢ is one of the most ingenious proposals in his brilliant paper on *Agamemnon* (*Journal of Philology*, No. 32). But yet it will not do. The word itself is no doubt a good word enough, but not only does it somehow not suit the context to my mind, it brings out into stronger relief the prosy εἰπὲν which precedes it. 'To speak a speech or a dirge' is conceivable English; 'to speak a dirge' is not. And so εἰπὲν ῥῆσιν ἢ θρήνον is conceivable Greek though the most deplorable poetry, but εἰπὲν θρήνον—no. Suppose then ἡρθνῆς the original, and we must also suppose εἰπὲν a second corruption later than ῥῆσιν, and caused by it. If, for instance, an editor found ἡμνεῖν ῥῆσιν ἢ θρήνον, he might well change ἡμνεῖν to εἰπὲν.

But what is more probable is that the whole phrase is simply a very bad stop-gap due to some one who found a lacuna in the line. There must be many such conjectural supplements in our Aeschylus. To give only a few examples of lacunae, it is notorious that they still remain at the ends of *Ag.* 1664, 1672, 1673; a bad supplement is to be found in 1025 δουλίας μάζης βία (where I should prefer φαγεῖν to any correction I have seen); later on we will discuss 1594-5. And I have no doubt whatever that at least two lines have gone between *Eum.* 431 and 432. When a whole line or several lines are lost, as in the last two cases, the ancient editor or copyist would probably leave well alone, but when he found a line defective in itself he would certainly fill it up as a rule, and I tremble to think how many atrocities may

be defended by some and ingeniously emended by others in Aeschylus which are due to no other cause than this.

To return to *Ag.* 1321. It would be easy to fill up the gap with better conjectures than the old editor's, such as ἅπαξ ἔθ' ἡμνεῖν ὕστατον θρήνον θέλω, but of course there is no hope of hitting on the truth. Considering the words ἐμὸν τὸν αὐτῆς, and comparing *Cho.* 925: εἴκοι θρηνεῖν ζῶσα πρὸς τύμβον μάτην, and *Supp.* 122: ζῶσα γόοις με τιμῶ, itself copied from *Iliad* Z 500, αἱ μὲν ἔτι ζῶν γόον Ἑκτορα Ἐφ' ἐνὶ Φοίῳ, I should suppose that Aeschylus repeated some idea of the kind here; ἅπαξ ἔτ' ἄδειν ἐν ζόοις is perhaps as near the original as we are likely to get.

1536. ψεκὰς δὲ λήγει.

I quite agree with Dr. Verrall that to say 'the shower is ceasing,' when you mean that it is beginning to rain heavily, is downright nonsense. Did not Aeschylus write δ' ἐπείγει, which would be corrupted to our text by practically the change of one letter?

By the way, is not δέδοικα κτύπον in the line above strong enough to defend Askew's correction of the ridiculous κτύπον δέδορκα at *Sept.* 100? Not that much defence can be needed by any one who supposes Aeschylus to have been a rational being.<sup>1</sup>

1594. τὰ μὲν ποδὶ ῥῆ καὶ χερῶν ἀκροὺς κτένας  
\* \* \* \* \*  
ἐθρυντ' ἀνωθεν ἀνθρακος καθημμένον  
ἄσμη'· ὁ δ' αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ.

ἀνθρακος καθημμένον, Housman; ἄσμη'· ὁ δ, Dindorf. I find from Wecklein's Appendix that I am anticipated by Hermann in assuming a lacuna after 1594, but as Hermann himself appears to have given it up, and as at any rate his suggestion has met with no favour since, it may be well to set forth the grounds which make such an assumption necessary.

The dogs which ate Jezebel, ravenous as Oriental dogs are, drew the line at the skull, the palms of the hands, and the soles of the feet. I have been told that the reason is that the hands and feet are exceedingly bitter; anyhow it is obvious that the most accomplished cookery could make little of them, and that they would be as liable to detection as the 'batrachian bones' which

<sup>1</sup> 'You must understand,' says Peter Quince, 'he goes but to see a noise that he heard'; Sir Toby Belch speaks of hearing by the nose; what do the editors of Aeschylus see or hear by?



revealed to a horror-stricken student of zoology what he had been allured into eating in Paris. To suppose that these were precisely the parts chosen by Atreus to set before Thyestes is simply monstrous. Besides we have been told by Cassandra what Thyestes *did* eat :

χείρας κρέων πλῆθοντες οἰκείας βορᾶς  
σὺν ἐντέροις τε σπλάγχν', ἐποίκτιστον γέμος,  
πρέπουσ' ἔχοντες, ὧν πατὴρ ἐγεύσατο.

Seneca must have surely had the account of Aeschylus in his mind when he produced his *Thyestes*. At the risk of being as sick as the eponymous hero I have reached to the end of that most disgusting of all works calling themselves tragedies, and this is what I find to illuminate our passage :

ipse divisum secat  
in membra corpus : amputat trunco tenus  
umeros patentes et lacertorum moras,  
denudat artus durus atque ossa amputat,  
tantum ora servat et datas fidei manus.

Haec ueribus haerent viscera et lentis  
data  
stillant caminis, illa flammatus latex  
candente aeno iactat. (760-767.)  
stridet in ueribus iecur. (770.)  
abscisa cerno capitu et auulsas manus  
et rupta fractis cruribus uestigia. (1042-3.)

And compare 1063-1067. Can there be any doubt that the details of the Thyestean banquet were the same as those of the banquet of Harpagus in Herodotus (i. 119), except that at the latter there were other guests present who fed upon mutton, while at the former no one was present except Thyestes?

Atreus then kept back head, hands, and feet, the rest he minced up (ἔθρυπτε) so that it should be unrecognizable. One line would be quite enough to fill up the gap, e.g.

κάρα τ' ἔκρυψε, σπλάγχνα δὲ ζὺν ἐντέροις

or any other line one likes to make up. Now too we can explain the μὲν of 1594. As the passage stands in the MSS. μὲν is as pointless as the rest is silly

'Part he roasted and part he boiled' says Herodotus, and so Euripides talks of both roasting and boiling in *Cyclops*, 245 seqq., ἀπ' ἀνθρακος | θερμὴν ἐλόντος δαῖτ' ἄτερ κρεανόμου | τὰ δ' ἐκ λέβητος ἐφθὰ καὶ τετηγότα (Housman). So also Seneca as quoted above. If this was copied by Seneca from our passage, it follows that more than one line must be

gone, but Aeschylus hurries over the details and probably Seneca, whose revolting imagination is beyond belief, added this *de suo*. Besides there were tragedies enough on Thyestes for him to draw from. We have ὅπας σάρκας however at *Ag.* 1082. But ἔθρυπτε does not suit either ordinary roasting or boiling; what it would suit exactly would be the preparation of a haggis. Compare now the roasting of pork at *Iliad*, ix. 213 :

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ πῦρ ἐκάη καὶ φλόξ ἑμαράνθη,  
ἀνθρακίην στορέσας ὀβόλους ἐφύπερθε τάνυσσε,

and the cooking of the haggis at *Odyssey*, xviii. 44 :

γαστέρες αἰδ' αἰγῶν κέατ' ἐν πυρί,

and the meaning of 'minced over lighted coals' is plain enough. It is a short way of saying : 'minced up as a haggis and cooked over lighted coals.' And—yes, Aeschylus is quite disgusting enough, but I suppose he found it in the story.

The last relic of cannibalism in Greece was the feast of the wolf-god in Arcadia, and the morsel of human flesh was a σπλάγχνον, ἐν ἄλλοις ἄλλων ἱερῶν ἐν ἐγκατατετρημένον (Plato, *Rep.* 565 D). The story of Thyestes is likely enough connected with some such ancient festival. The σπλάγχνα were particularly eaten by cannibals because thereby they could gain a portion of the mental qualities of the victim. Thus after the heroic death of Bréboeuf the Indians crowded round to eat his heart that some of that unexampled fortitude might pass into their own. And hence we may perhaps understand how it was that the tradition spoke especially of σπλάγχνα ὧν πατὴρ ἐγεύσατο, and why Aeschylus says ἔθρυπτε here, suggesting just the same ideas as in the passage of Plato quoted above.

Then again I find another legend of cannibalism, with several points of resemblance, in the 200th Orphic fragment (ed. Abel). The Titans, after tearing Dionysus in pieces, λέβητά τινα τρίποδι ἐπιθέοντες καὶ τοῦ Διονύσου ἐμβάλλοντες (ἰμβυαλόντες) τὰ μέλη καθήψουν πρότερον ἔπειτα ὀβελίσκοις περιτείραντες ὑπείρεχον Ἥφαιστοιο. Then Zeus, perceiving the savour τῶν ὀπωμένων κρέων, κερανὴ τοὺς Τιτᾶνας αἰκίζεσθαι. Thus Clemens Alexandrinus, and Firmicus Maternus, telling the same story, says : 'decocta variis generibus pueri membra consumunt.' Athena kept the heart, partly 'ut manifestum delationis esset indicium.'<sup>1</sup> So we have

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Proclus, *Hymns*, vii. 11-13.

here a similar confusion of cookery, and an 'indicium' consisting of a part of the victim. A festival was held by the Cretans at which they celebrated the passion of

Dionysus, though there does not appear to have been any cannibalism practised as in Arcadia.

ARTHUR PLATT.

#### NOTE ON AESCH. PR. V. 358.

AESCH. PR. v. 358. Τυφῶνα θούρον πᾶσιν ὡς ἀντίστη θεοῖς.

Various emendations have been proposed to correct the metre in the MS. text of this line but none are satisfactory. The two which seem most popular πᾶσιν ὡς ἀντίστη and πᾶσι δ' ἀντίστη give, the former a most ugly rhythm, the latter a most ugly shape of sentence, though it is fair to add that the latter is really part of a larger emendation and ought never to have been taken separately. The suggestion that ἀντίστη is a gloss for προύστη is more attractive but it

would be simpler still to omit ὡς and punctuate

Τυφῶνα θούρον πᾶσιν ἀντίστη θεοῖς

That is, the narrative of what T. did begins with πᾶσιν. The absence of connecting relative or particle is perhaps an objection to this suggestion, but I do not think it is conclusive: certainly it is a lesser objection than those which can be brought against the other conjectures quoted.

F. HAVERFIELD.

#### NOTES ON THUCYDIDES, BOOK VI.

I AM greatly honoured by the remarks contributed by Mr. G. C. Richards to the November number of this Review. Before proceeding to comment on them, I wish to say something about vi. 20 χρήματά τ' ἔχουσι τὰ μὲν ἴδια, τὰ δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἔστι Σελινουντίους Συρακοσίους δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ βαρβάρων τινῶν ἀπαρχὴν φέρεται.

Weidner's conjecture [Σελινουντίους] is accepted by Dr. Hude, but I hope that in his Teubner text he will restore the word to life. Mr. G. A. Papabasilios in Πλάτων, 1884, p. 79, reads the passage thus: χρήματά τε [ἔχουσι] τὰ μὲν ἴδια, τὰ δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἔστι Σελινουντίους < καὶ Συρακοσίους >. Συρακοσίους δὲ καὶ κ.τ.λ. To be sure, this is just what Thucydides means, but the alterations of the text are wrong; at least the insertion, I am confident, is an error. If the writer had looked at ii. 70, 3, vii. 57, 3, 4, he would have found a similar passage in which a statement that by itself is inaccurate is made clear by an addition that amplifies or corrects that which precedes. The first is ξυνέβησαν ἐξελθεῖν αὐτοὺς καὶ παῖδας καὶ γυναῖκας καὶ τοὺς ἐπικούρους ξὺν ἐνὶ ἱματίῳ, γυναῖκας δὲ ξὺν δυοῖν. The other is τῶν μὲν ὑπάρχον καὶ φόρου ὑποτελῶν. Μολήσιοι

καὶ Σάμιοι καὶ Χίοι. τούτων Χίοι οὐχ ὑποτελεῖς ὄντες φόρον. It may be replied that in these two passages the first statement is by inclusion of too much, whereas in vi. 20 the inaccuracy of the first statement is one of exclusion of an essential. Nevertheless the principle is the same: in all a step in the reasoning is omitted: in the one πλὴν γυναικῶν, in another πλὴν Χίων, in another καὶ Συρακοσίους. There is also i. 17, ἐπράχθη τε οὐδὲν ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἔργον ἀξιόλογον. . . οἱ γὰρ ἐν Σικελίᾳ ἐπὶ πλείστον ἐχώρησαν δυνάμει, where πλὴν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν Σικελίᾳ is wanting to the first statement, and where Cobet's alluring emendation, μόνοι γὰρ οἱ ἐν Σικελίᾳ, is quite superfluous.

I now return to the passages, to my rendering of which Mr. Richards raises objections. And in doing so, I may assure him that I have no other wish than to arrive at the truth. For this purpose I shall proceed experimentally, and will first contrast again my version with Jowett's version (which is the commonly approved version) of c. 89, 6. This passage stands, according to the rearrangement I gave in the October number, as follows:—

ἡμεῖς δὲ τοῦ ξύμπαντος προσέστημεν, δικαιούντες

ἐν ᾧ σχήματι μεγίστη ἡ πόλις ἐτύγχανε καὶ ἐλευθερωτάτῃ οὕσα καὶ ὅπως ἐδέξατό τις, τοῦτο ξυνδιασφύζειν. ἐπεὶ δημοκρατίαν γε καὶ ἐγινώσκουμεν οἱ φρονούντες τι (καὶ αὐτὸς οὐδενὸς ἂν χεῖρον, ὅσῳ κἂν (!) λαιδορήσαιμι ἀλλὰ περὶ ὁμολογουμένης ἀνοίας οὐδὲν ἂν καίνον λέγοιτο), καὶ τὸ μεθιστάναι αὐτὴν οὐκ ἐδόκει ἡμῖν ἀσφαλὲς εἶναι. I construe from ἐπεὶ thus: 'For democracy was both known by us who had sense (and I myself should be inferior to none of us in sense, i.e. superior to any, by the amount of abuse I might pour on it: but concerning acknowledged madness nothing new could be said), and to change its character did not seem to us to be safe.'

Now Mr. Richards says that with φρονοῖν, I ought to understand, 'By abusing democracy I should be more sensible than you *my hearers*' (the italics are mine). I reply that this cannot be the construe. καὶ αὐτὸς οὐδενὸς ἂν χεῖρον is a parenthetical remark on οἱ φρονούντες τι, so that οὐδενὸς must mean in this context οὐδενὸς τῶν φρονούντων τι. I reply further that Jowett's way, the accepted way to which Mr. R. assents, gives precisely the same meaning to οὐδενὸς that I give to it: but in my way, with φρονοῖν understood, it is even plainer that not ἑμῶν but τῶν φρονούντων is mentally supplied to οὐδενός. What does Mr. R. supply to ὅσῳ καὶ (μᾶλλον ἂν)? He himself says 'than others.' Why may I not do the same with οὐδενός? I only give to 'others' its obvious meaning when sandwiched between φρονούντες and φρονοῖν.

Mr. R. says that the sentiment that I attribute to Alcibiades 'would be a very natural thing for him to say,' but that it seems hardly to be got out of the words. When I look at the other ways of taking the passage, I am constrained to say that my rendering comes more easily out of the words than any other. It does not matter whether I construe 'I should be more sensible' or render freely 'I should show the superiority of my insight'; for the sense is 'We were sensible—and I should be the most sensible of us all were I to abuse (or rebuke, if Mr. R. prefers) it.' How can Mr. R. deny that λαιδορία would here be the outward sign of the sense that would be in the man? To say φαινόμεν ἂν φρονῶν would be sheer waste of words, and not at all appropriate in manner to the hurry and impatience of the speaker.

But further, it seems to me strange that nobody attempts to explain why, if οὐδενὸς ἂν χεῖρον (γινώσκουμι) is right, the optative with ἂν is used. How is the knowledge of Alcibiades conditional on his indulging in a

more violent λαιδορία? His superior *prudence* is conditional upon that: but the *knowledge* he possessed already.

Mr. R. indulges in a mild λαιδορία upon my neglect of the commentary to Jowett, and he says that the parallels cited in the note to Jowett justify the omission of μᾶλλον with ὅσῳ. Most true; but 'omission' is a mere quibble, because any one who looks carefully at the parallels cited will see that μᾶλλον is indeed 'omitted in them,' but does not need to be 'supplied' to make sense. The passages are vi. 92, ὅσῳ τὰ μὲν Ἀθηναίων οἶδα, τὰ δ' ἑμέτερα ἤκαζον, v. 90, ὅσῳ καὶ ἐπὶ μεγίστῃ τιμωρίᾳ κ.τ.λ., and v. 108, ὅσῳ πρὸς μὲν τὰ ἔργα . . ἐγγὺς κείμεθα, τῆς δὲ γνώμης . . πιστότεροι ἐτέρων ἐσμέν. The fact is that after reading the note in Poppo, I not unfrequently find that the note in Jowett may be passed over in silence. This is the case in the present instance; for Mr. R. will find out whence the passages cited in Jowett were obtained, and whence others might have been obtained if he looks in Poppo's *Editio Maxima*. The really important thing to know here is not the note in J., but Hermann's contention that μᾶλλον is to be extracted from χεῖρον, on which I have only to say that all the λαιδορία that Alcibiades might utter would constitute, in the eyes of the Spartans, a claim to φρόνησις superior to the φρόνησις of men who had not uttered any λαιδορία of democracy, but had preferred ξυνδιασφύζειν τὴν δημοκρατίαν.

The second passage is c. 69, 1, where Mr. R. says that the passage will obviously construe in my way; but, he asks, why not render 'Though they did not expect the Athenians to begin the attack, and though they had to defend themselves on the spur of the moment . . nevertheless they took up their arms, etc.'? I answer, for the reason that Stahl explains; which is that διὰ τάχους ἀναγκαζόμενοι ἀμύνασθαι cannot be *concessive* to ἀναλαβόντες τὰ ὅπλα etc. You might as well say to a burglar in your bedroom 'though you compel me to defend myself on a sudden, nevertheless I seize the poker and go for you.' The circumstance is the cause of the act. But what Stahl himself does not see is (1) that οὐκ ἂν οἴεσθαι . . ἐπελθεῖν means 'though they would not have been thinking that the A. would suddenly attack them, unless they had seen them actually coming'—the ἂν belonging both to the participle and to the infin.; (2) that καὶ ἀναγκαζόμενοι ἀμύνασθαι depends on οἴεσθαι ἂν. It is therefore just possible that ἂν has dropped out before ἀναγκαζόμενοι, though Hude has written to me objecting thus:

'Si particula *ἀν* inserta infinitious ad *οἰόμενοι* referatur, *ἀναγκαζόμενοι* valde supervacaneum fit.'

Next we have c. 23, 1, where again Mr. R. thinks my construe possible, but prefers a different explanation. He is quite right in his contention that Nicias is comparing the Athenian forces with the combined forces of seven Sicilian cities, and not merely with the forces of Syracuse, as I erroneously stated. But if he looks at Stahl's note, he will see that there are grave objections to taking τὸ μάχικον τὸ ὀπλιτικόν to mean 'their total strength of hoplites.' Mr. R. says that Nicias is taking a very gloomy view of the comparative forces. How then does he explain μὴ ἀντίπαλον μόνον . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπερβάλλοντες τοῖς πᾶσι? That is not a gloomy, but an optimistic estimate. It seems to me clear that Nicias here is granting for the sake of argument that Athens can send a force of infantry able to match the hoplite force of the seven confederated cities. Mr. R. says that such a thing was 'manifestly impossible.' Even if it were so, the impossibility would only increase the force of Nicias' argument, for he would then be assuming an impossibility. But why should not Athens get hoplites from her allies to make up the number required? Classen saw that τὸ ὀπλιτικόν means the Athenian hop-

lites, and Stahl's objections to him are answered when τὸ ὀπλιτικόν is referred to παρασκευασμένοι.<sup>1</sup> The only certain impossibility, dismissed contemptuously by Nicias in πλὴν γε πρὸς τὸ μάχικον αὐτῶν, is that Athens should bring a force of hoplites into the field strong enough to counter-balance not merely the hoplites of the seven towns, but the hoplites *with* light-armed troops and cavalry.

In c. 87, 5 I explain τῶν ἡμῖν ποιουμένων as 'our general conduct' instead of 'our enterprise in Sicily.' Mr. R. has altogether the better of me; for von Essen reveals the horrid fact that τὰ ποιούμενα everywhere else in Thuc. means 'what is going on' at the time to which the leading verb refers. The context favours my view; but I cannot maintain it in the face of the parallels.

I am much gratified that my notes on c. 21, 2 and 46, 2 command Mr. Richards' assent, and I only regret that he has not explained why he finds my explanation of c. 87, 4 'unconvincing,' when all other explanations except those that require an alteration of the text have been proved to be impossible.

E. C. MARCHANT.

<sup>1</sup> Since writing the above I have been much gratified to find that Mr. John Argyriades in his *κριτικὰ καὶ ἐμνηνευτικὰ διορθώσεις* explains this passage exactly as I have done.

#### ON AN EPIGRAM OF LEONIDAS OF TARENTUM, A.P. IX. 335.

THE Palatine codex gives this epigram thus:—

Ἵλοφόρον τῷγαλμαθ' ὀδοιπόρε Μικαλίωνος  
Ἑρμῆς δ' ἂν λί δε τον κρήνον ἱλοφόρον,  
ὥς ἐξ οἰζυρῆς ἠπίστατο δωροδοκῆσαι  
ἐργασίης· αἰὲν δ' ὠγαθὸς ἐστ' ἀγαθός.

τῷγαλμα Planudes.

J. Geffken, in his recently published edition of the *Epigrams of Leonidas of Tarentum* (supplement to Fleckeisen's *Jahrbücher* for 1896, p. 99) writes: 'Die lesart des Planudes τῷγαλμα ist wol die allein berechnigte. Was machen wir mit zwei Bildern? Die Sache liegt so. Mikalion, der arme Holzsammler, widmet ein Hermesbild. Dieses redet: (Das ist) das Bild, Wanderer, vom Holzsammler Mikalion (gestiftet), ein Hermes; siehe aber, wie wacker der Holzsammler ist u.s.w.'

Against this, I would urge that τῷγαλμαθ' (i.e. τῷ ἀγάλματι = τῷγάλμαθ') has every mark

of sincerity. (1) It scans, (2) the dual is intelligible, if we suppose the two figures to be those of the wood-carrier himself and the god Hermes. But whereas the figure of the former is expressed by a genitive (Μικαλίωνος), the latter is in the appositive nominative, Ἑρμῆς, a misunderstanding of which caused the confusion which has got into the immediately following words. For δ' then I would write τ', and accepting Jacob's correction ἀλλ' ἰδὲ τὸν write the distich thus:—

Ἵλοφόρον τῷγάλμαθ', ὀδοιπόρε, Μικαλίωνος  
Ἑρμῆς τ'. ἀλλ' ἰδὲ τὸν κρήνον ἱλοφόρον.

'duae figurae, uiator, lignatoris sunt Micalionis, Mercuriusque: at tu cerne bonum lignatorem quomodo scierit ex misera vitae condicione donum praestare: bonus enim, siue pauper siue diues, semper bonus est.' Hesych. δωροδοκεῖν· δῶρα λαμβάνειν. δωροδοκία· τὸ λαβεῖν ἢ δοῦναι δῶρα.

ROBINSON ELLIS.



NOTE ON *ILIAD* XX. 18.

Υ 18 τῶν γὰρ νῦν ἄγχιστα μάχη πόλεμός τε δέδωκε.

In these words Poseidon in the great council of the gods on Olympus gives his reason for supposing that Zeus has some communication or proposal to make touching the Trojans and Achaeans. So much is certain: but when the exact nature of the reason alleged comes to be considered, there is much difference of opinion. Consequently another attempt to solve the problem may perhaps be tolerated. At first sight the line seems simple enough. It presents no difficulty except the interpretation of the adverb ἄγχιστα. This has been variously dealt with, but never satisfactorily determined. To prove this it becomes necessary to enumerate as concisely as possible the different explanations propounded. There is no need to specify the several advocates and supporters of each by name. ἐπίφθορον γάρ.

At the particular moment when Poseidon is speaking there is no actual fighting going on. Both sides are arming for the coming battle, in which Achilles is to appear at last. This circumstance has materially influenced the view of some of the exponents of our line, and therefore must by no means be left out of account.

Some take ἄγχιστα in its regular and natural sense of proximity in place. (1) 'For now the fighting and warring of them are kindled at closest quarters.' The Greeks and Trojans are no longer skirmishing, ἐκαστὸν ἰστάμενοι, but fighting foot to foot and man to man. However, as they had been hard at it with little intermission through several books from E onward, the statement, though lucid enough, scarcely coincides with the facts.

(2) 'The war and the fighting of them are kindled very nigh,' 'valde prope exarsit.' This again is not literally true, for Olympus cannot be accurately described as very near the plain of Troy. And even if it were so, what then?

Dissatisfied with the above, others have taken ἄγχιστα to refer to proximity of time, 'almost immediately.' (3) 'The war is very nearly aflame,' 'is just on the point of bursting out,' 'proxime est ut bellum exardescat.' This is perhaps the most popular view, but hardly more adequate than No. 1 to describe the actual situation, con-

sidering there has only been a brief lull in the fighting, unless we charitably suppose that exigences of space prevented Homer from inserting πάλιν or πάλιν αὖτις or words to that effect. There is besides the somewhat grave objection that it is more than doubtful whether ἄγχι, though of frequent occurrence, is ever used in the Homeric poems in reference to time. The only example quoted is τ 301, where it is quite possible that the local sense is the right one.

Again it is said that the words mean vaguely (4) 'The war has come to a crisis,' a quite suitable sense indeed, for Achilles, as has been already stated, is just on the point of taking a decisive part in the struggle. Unfortunately it cannot be shown that this meaning is expressed at all by ἄγχιστα δέδωκε. We should rather require μάλιστα than ἄγχιστα.

It has even been proposed to take this troublesome adverb closely with τῶν and to render 'of those who are most closely connected with us,' who are ἡμῖνοι, related to ourselves by direct descent. Unfortunately again this construction is quite at variance with Homeric usage, and cannot be entertained for one moment.

In one respect however this last version is worthy of attention. It rightly suggests that ἄγχιστα may indicate a proximity to the gods themselves, not a local but a metaphorical one, just as we frequently find it used of close resemblance in ἄγχιστα εἰκώς, etc.

I propose therefore to render: 'For their fighting and battling now flare out with closest interest for us,' 'For 'tis their warfare in full blaze that now most nearly concerns us.' The emphasis lies upon ἄγχιστα, which contains the real predication, and not upon δέδωκε, which merely adds a picturesque touch. μάχη ἄγχιστα δέδωκε may be translated 'the fiery fight touches us very closely.' The error of No. 4 is that it attempts, if anything, to reverse this emphasis.

Poseidon thinks it likely that the business to be laid before the assembled gods is connected with the war before Troy, because as he says, there is no other subject of such immediate interest to the gods themselves. 'That hotly contested struggle concerns us more nearly than anything else that is happening at the present time in the world below.'

T. L. AGAR.

OVID'S *HEROIDES*.

ALL Ovid's works, except the amatory poems, are now equipped with a decent apparatus criticus. The apparatus to the amatory poems is no more decent than themselves: the three chief MSS containing them were collated by Keil in 1851: his collations were lent to three editors in succession, Merkel Riese and Ehwald, and remain unpublished to this day; for let no one fancy that what stands on pp. xiv—xvi and xx—xxii of Merkel's preface is anything but a string of excerpts. But Korn in the *ex Ponto*, Korn and Mr Riese in the *metamorphoses*, Mr Riese and Merkel in the *fasti*, Mr Ellis in the *Ibis*, Mr Owen in the *tristia*, Mr Kunz in the *medicamina*, Mr Sedlmayer in the *heroides*, Mr de Vries in the *Sappho*, have furnished full and exact collations of the principal MSS. Nothing is now lacking but an editor. But Nicolaus Heinsius is dead and buried; and Ovid, in spite of all this new material, is perhaps in a worse condition than he was two hundred years ago.

Merkel and his followers accomplish this result, not merely by depraving the text with a number of bad readings drawn from good MSS, but by two other methods, both efficacious: they expel the emendations of Heinsius, and they insert their own. With few exceptions, of which Mr Palmer is much the most conspicuous, Ovid's modern editors have been unfortunately distinguished by the very least Ovidian qualities in the world: an instinctive distaste for simplicity and a warm affection for the hispid. To read, for instance, the latest German and English texts of the *tristia*, you would sometimes fancy that the editors had mistaken the meaning of *ex Pont. iv 13 19* 'Getico scripsi sermone libellum' and supposed the *tristia* to be the 'libellus' in question. Merkel, whom his adherents call *sospitator Ovidii* and other such names, and who really did make some good emendations among many bad, is well described by Madvig: 'in textu recensendo iudicii contortioris et ad artificiosa et obscura inclinantis, non ita raro certissimarum emendationum ab aliis factarum contemptor, nouarum inuentor subabsurdarum et prope incredibilium.' Mr Riese is saved by common sense and a comparative purity of taste from the most grotesque excesses of the two Teubner editors, but he is fully their accomplice in their worst offence. It is not that they afford so little illumination

themselves: it is that they stand between us and the light. In the 17th and 18th centuries Ovid was as lucky as he is unlucky now. He was intently studied and brilliantly emended by the two greatest of all critics of Latin poetry. The discoveries of those critics are uncongenial to our modern editors, who treat them accordingly. They steadfastly ignore the work of Bentley, and they diligently undo the work of Heinsius.

The *heroides* have been less unfortunate than any other portion of Ovid's works. They have been edited by Mr Palmer, who, if his judgment is not equal to his genius, has at any rate emended Ovid with more success than any man of this century but Madvig. The MSS have been examined and classified with care and discretion by Mr Sedlmayer in his *prolegomena critica* 1878. They form three families, the first represented by P (Parisinus 8242 saec. xi), beyond comparison the most important MS, the second by G (Guelferbytanus extran. 260 saec. xii), the third less distinctly by a number of MSS among which E (fragmentum Etonense saec. xi) is the oldest but not the best.

## I 13—22.

In te fingebam uiolentos Troas ituros,  
nomine in Hectoreo pallida semper  
eram.

sive quis Antilochum narrabat ab Hec-  
tore uictum

15

Antilochus nostri causa timoris erat,  
sive Menoetiaden falsis cecidisse sub  
armis

flebam successu posse carere dolos.  
sanguine Tlepolemus Lyciam tepefecerat  
hastam,

Tlepolemi leto cura nouata mea est. 20  
denique, quisquis erat castris iugulatus

Achiuis,  
frigidius glacie pectus amantis erat.

15. The words 'Antilochum ab Hectore uictum' could not in any context represent what happens at *Iliad* O 583-91, where there is no combat at all, but Antilochus sees Hector coming and instantly runs off into safety. Least of all can that be the reference here, where Penelope is making the most of her fears and *vanquished* must be held to imply *killed*: see the following verses and especially the summary in 21 '*denique quisquis erat...*

*ingulatus*'. But Antilochus was not killed by Hector. Say it were possible for Ovid to forget not only the Aethiopis but also the express statement of Homer in Od. 8 187 sq. that Antilochus was killed by Memnon: what Ovid could neither forget himself nor hope that his readers would forget is that Antilochus in the Iliad survives Hector and is nowhere so brimful of life as after Hector's death, in  $\Psi$  287-613. The so-called Hyginus indeed in fab. 113 'quem quis occidit' has the words 'Hector Protesilaum, idem Antilochum'. But if that statement is uncorrupt it doubtless comes from this very passage of Ovid, for Ovid is one of Hyginus' authorities. Since however only six lines above in fab. 112 'qui cum quo dimicarunt' he writes 'Antilochus cum Memnone: Antilochus occiditur', and since you expect at least to find Patroclus among Hector's slain, Moriz Schmidt is probably right in assuming some such lacuna as this: 'Hector Protesilaum, idem Patroclum. Memnon Antilochum.

But what seems to me an even worse and less credible fault than this contradiction of a notorious story is the penury and resourcelessness of *Hectore* and *nomine Hectoreo* in two consecutive lines. Therefore, instead of such bold expedients as changing Antilochus twice over into Amphimachus or Anchialus, I should write

sive quis Antilochum narrabat ab hoste  
*reuictum*.

Thus the three examples taken will refer to the three chief champions of Troy: Memnon, Hector, Sarpedon.

*victum* is so common and *reuictum* so rare that the false division (compare trist. i. 9 33 where the best MS. has *turnere lata* for *Turne relata*) is nothing to wonder at: then, under the influence of *Hectoreo* above, *hostere* passed, probably through the transposition *hestore*, into *hectore*. This particular form of error I illustrated in Journ. Phil. vol. xviii pp. 31 sq.: here are more examples: Ovid her. iv 45 *uersare*, *seruare*, ars ii 729 *seruandus*, *uersandus*, (I should add Verg. buc. x 68 *seruemus*, *uersemus*), met. v 246 *detrectas*, *detraetes*, ex Pont. ii 10 43 *absim* (read *apsim*), *psam*, Plaut. rud. 545 *ballena*, *bellana*, Sen. Thy. 416 *dantem*, *tandem*, Here. Oet. 496 *facilis* in species, *faciles* *inspiciēs*, Stat. Theb. ii 311 *descisse*, *discesse*, *copa* 34 *prisca*, *crispa*, Cic. ad Att. iv 5 2 *facierem*, *feceram*. A close parallel to this corruption of *hostere* by transposition to *hestore* and

thence by external influence to *hectore* occurs in her. viii 69 where Ovid wrote *distinet* but our MSS give *destinat*: the mistake began with the spelling *distenet*, which is not very uncommon in MSS as old as P; then came the transposition *destinet*, and then the grammatical correction *destinat*: at Hor. epist. i 2 5 the MSS exhibit a similar sequence in full, *distinet* the true reading, *distenet*, *destinet*, and finally *detinet* to make sense.

The verb 'reuinco' is used once again by Ovid fast. vi 432 'iudicio forma reuicta tua est', once by Horace carm. iv 4 24, thrice by Lucretius i 593, iv 488, v 409. In prose it generally means 'refuto' or 'conuinceo', and so it does at Lucr. iv 488; at Lucr. v 409 and in Horace it may mean 'uicissim uinco', but need not; at Lucr. i 593 and in Ovid it seems to mean simply 'uinco'.

## II 105-118.

Iamque tibi exidimus; nullam, puto,  
Phyllida nosti. 105  
d e t tui, quae sim Phyllis et unde,  
sgas.  
quae tibi, Demophoon, longis erroribus  
acto  
Threicios portus hospitiumque dedi,  
cuius opes auxere meae, cui diues egenti  
munera multa dedi, multa datura fui, 110  
quae tibi subieci latissima regna Lycurgi  
nomine femineo uix satis apta regi,  
qua patet umbrosum Rhodope glacialis  
ad Haemum  
et sacer admissas exigit Hebrus  
aquas,  
cui mea uirginitas auibus libata sinistris 115  
castaque fallaci zona recincta manu.  
pronuba Tisiphone thalamis ululauit in  
illis  
et cecinit maestum deuia carmen auis.

Phyllis professes to fear that Demophoon has forgotten her very existence, and proceeds therefore to remind him who she is,—that Phyllis who did him so much kindness, 107 'quae tibi', 111 'quae tibi'. But into the midst of these relatives relating to Phyllis there intrudes the preposterous distich 109 sq., with 'cuius' and 'cui' relating not to Phyllis but to Demophoon; and then after 'quae' for Phyllis in 111 you slip back again to 'cui' for Demophoon in 115: for all the world as if she were explaining to Demophoon who Demophoon was. As for 109 sq., the only way to fit that couplet

for the post it occupies is to write with brutal violence 'cuius opes auxere tuas, quae diues egenti' cet. If Ovid put it where it stands he must have written *tuas* and *quae*; but if Ovid had written *tuas* and *quae* the scribes would not have written *meae* and *cui*; therefore Ovid did not put it where it stands. Accordingly Suringar placed 109 sq. after 114: but there they dangle miserably, as 115 sq. already do, from the distant 'tibi' of 111; and they are the merest repetition of what has been said more vigorously above. Madvig, who makes the same transposition, corrects the former vice but does not much disguise the latter by putting a full stop at the end of 114, and writing interrogatively 'cuius opes auxere meae? cui.....datura fui?' I propose therefore to make one slight alteration more. Transpose the distich with Suringar, put a full stop after 114 with Madvig, and proceed with the fresh sentence thus:

cuius opes auxere meae, cui diues egenti 109  
munera multa dedi, multa datura fui,  
huic mea uirginitas anibus libata sinis-  
tris  
castaque fallaci zona recincta m. 114 115  
pronuba Tisiphone cet.

Down to 114 she enumerates her benefits to Demophon: then she goes on 'the man for whom I did all this and was ready to do more repaid me only by betrayal': 109 sq. sum up, for the purpose of this contrast, what has already been said at length. *cui* in 115 may come from the loss of the initial and the rearrangement of the letters *uic*.

## V 81—88.

Non ego miror opes, nec me tua regia  
tangit,  
nec de tot Priami dicar ut una nurus;  
non tamen ut Priamus nymphae socer  
esse recuset,  
aut Hecubae fuerim dissimulanda  
nurus.  
dignaque sum et cupio fieri matrona  
potentis;  
sunt mihi, quas possint sceptrā decere,  
manus.  
nec me, faginea quod tecum fronde  
iacebam,  
despice: purpureo sum magis apta  
toro.

85. Cupio fieri matrona potentis! With these dignified and persuasive words does

Oenone expect to win back her lover. She wants to marry a person of importance; Paris is the only such person who happens to be handy; surely then he will not say no. And just five lines above she has declared 'non ego miror opes, nec me tua regia tangit'!

Faber proposed 'dignaque sum regis fieri matrona potentis', which effectually mends the sense; and there ought to be no doubt that this indecent *et cupio* is a mere stopgap for some lost word which invested 'potentis' with a clearer meaning. But there is no reason to be seen why *regis* should fall out; and Ovid more likely wrote

dignaque sum fieri rerum matrona  
potentis:

*rerum* perishing between *ieri* to the left of it and *in* to the right. 'rerum potentis' = 'summo imperio praediti', Lucr. ii 50 and iii 1027 'reges rerumque potentes'.

## VI 25—40.

'Aesonides' dixi 'quid agit meus?'  
ille pudore 25  
haesit in opposita lumina fixus humo.  
protinus exilui tunicisque a pectore  
ruptis  
'uiuit an' exclamo 'me quoque fata  
uocant?'  
'uiuit' ait. timidum quod amat: iurare  
coegi.  
uix mihi teste deo credita uita tua est. 30  
ut rediit animus, tua facta requirere  
coepi.  
narrat aenipedes Martis arasse boues,  
uipereos dentes in humum pro semine  
iactos  
et subito natos arma tulisse uiros,  
terrigenas populos ciuili marte peremp-  
tos 35  
inplesse aetatis fata diurna suae.  
[deuictus serpens. iterum, si uiuat  
Iason,  
quaerimus. alternant spesque timor-  
que fidem.]  
85 singula dum narrat, studio cursuque  
loquendi  
detegit ingenio uulnera nostra suo. 40

I print this passage as I believe it ought to stand: In 29 the admirable reading of E and a few other MSS, *timidum quod amat*, has already been adopted by Mr Shuckburgh, who compares i 12 'res est solliciti plena timoris amor'. This part of the epistle is



torn out of P: the rest of the MSS have *timidum quod ait* or *timidumque mihi* or the like. Some editors accept Heinsius' conjecture 'uinit, ait *timidus: timidum iurare coegi*'; but if Heinsius had known of the reading of E he would not have made that conjecture. At 31 Merkel Riese Sedlmayer and Ehwald give *utque animus rediit*, because it is in G: Mr Palmer reads as above with a few MSS, because he is a competent critic. At xiii 29 occur the very same variants, the metrical interpolation *utque animus rediit* in G, the Ovidian *ut rediit animus* in other MSS; but P, which is absent here, is there present, and of course supports the latter. Round goes the weathercock: Merkel and his retinue adopt in that place the true reading which they reject in this and which they would reject again in that if P were absent. They apparently edit ep. vi before they have read ep. xiii, and do not edit ep. xiii until they have forgotten ep. vi.

Merkel Palmer and Ehwald obelise 31-38 as spurious. I know not which to wonder at more: those who think that 37 sq. are Ovid's, or those who think that 31-36 are not Ovid's. 37 sq. are a shameful interpolation, ungrammatical in language, inept in sense, and destructive of coherency; for all they do is to prevent 'singula dum narrat' from following as it ought on the narration, and to make it follow on an interruption of the narration. But as for 31-36, it is really too bad that Ovid should be robbed of these splendid verses because 'they follow too closely after the similar account vs. 10-14'. The repetition is one of his most triumphant feats. In 10-14 he has related the labours of Iason, and you think you never read a more sterling piece of rhetorical description:

isse sacros Martis sub iuga panda  
boues,  
seminibus iactis segetes adolesse uir-  
orum  
inque necem dextra non eguisse tua,  
peruigilem spoliū pecudis seruasse  
draconem,  
raptā tamen forti uellera fulua manu.

Now, to show you how easy it is to him, he relates them over again in new language, and does it even more brilliantly than before: there is no better written couplet in all his works than 35 sq. He stops before he comes to the dragon and the fleece, partly for variety, partly that 'singula dum narrat' may come in the more natur-

NO. XCIV. VOL. XI.

ally. The diligent interpolator misses an equivalent to 13 sq. and inserts his precious 'serpens'.

#### VI 107, 108.

Illa sibi Tanai Scythiaque paludibus  
udae  
quaerat et a patria Phasidis usque  
uirum.

Medea might seek a husband a *Phaside* or a *patria sua*, but not a *patria Phasidis*, for there is no such place. Aethiopia is *patria Nili*: the Nile, 'qui patriam tantae tam bene celat aquae' (am. iii 6 40), rises there and flows thence into Egypt. Greece is *patria Alpei*, because Alpheus runs under sea to Sicily; but it is not *patria Eurotae*. *patria Tiberis* can stand for Etruria or for Umbria, whichever the Tiber takes its rise in, but for Italy it cannot stand; and *patria Phasidis* is the name for nothing on earth. *patria* is *pria*, which is *ripa* with one letter out of place.

Now will it be believed that this necessary and certain emendation was made long before me by Richard Bentley; that it was published three-quarters of a century ago; and that not one editor of Ovid has accepted it, and only one has even mentioned it? Bentley's emendations are the most important contribution to the criticism of Ovid which has been made since Heinsius. Since they were published in the Oxford edition of 1825-6, many MSS of Ovid have been collated with the utmost diligence; but no collation of any MS since 1826, or indeed since 1661, has helped so much towards purifying the text as Bentley's emendations might have helped. Haupt again and again called attention to their value; but who was Haupt, that an editor of Ovid should listen to him? It is hard to write without bitterness of the loss of time inflicted on an intelligent student by editors who cannot even be trusted to hand down the discoveries which their betters have made. You are reading v 121 in a vulgar text:

dixerat: in cursu famulae rapuere  
furentem.

*dixerat* is flatly contradicted by *in cursu rapuere*: you think for a long or a short time, you remember am. i 8 109 or fast. v 245, and you write 'uox erat in cursu: famulae' cet. And this correction was made by Heinsius and approved by Bentley! and not an editor mentions it except Mr

Sedlmayer, who mentions all Bentley's conjectures, not because he thinks they deserve it, but because the Oxford edition is scarce. There would be no end, if I drew up a list of the places in Ovid where I have been put to the trouble of making Bentley's and especially Heinsius' conjectures over again and wasting hours which might have been profitably employed; but I must quote from the *heroides* one place more, where the correction is necessary and important and absolutely disregarded: viii 33 sq. 'at pater Aeacio promiserat, inscius acti: | plus *patre*, quo prior est ordine, pollet auus' Bentley, for *quoque* (or *quoque qui*)..... *posset* (or *possit*): the editors retain the text, with its meaningless *quoque* and its foolish subjunctive, all except Mr Palmer

who introduces a conjecture of his own which is rather impossible than improbable.

Sometimes it is the MS reading that one has to recover by guessing. In xv (*Sappho*) 129 sq. all the editors print this nonsense:

oscula cognosco, quae tu committere  
linguae  
aptaque consueras accipere, apta dare.

One immediately corrects 'committere (= coniungere) *lingua*', and compares am. ii 5 23 sq. 'inproba tum uero iungentes oscula uidi, | illa mihi *lingua nexa* fuisse liquet'. And *lingua* is the reading of the best MS!

A. E. HOUSMAN.

(To be continued.)

#### PLAUTUS, *EPIDICUS* 19 AND 625.

*Epid.* 19. In my edition of the play I adopted Ussing's reading, viz.:

Thesp. *Quid tibi vis dicam nisi quod est?*  
Epid. *Ut id mi responses probe,*  
*Quid erilis noster filius?*

Of the MSS. A has *UTILLAERES COSTENTA* and B has *UTILLIRES POND*i. whence Mr. E. W. Fay proposes (*Amer. Journ. of Phil.* xv. 3) *ut illae res cosentant* 'so that your facts may agree.' He thinks that the reading of A may have come from a gloss *constant*, while from a gloss *respondeant* we get B's reading. Plautus *Cas.* 59 has *cosentit* and *cosentant* would stand to *cosentiant* as *evenant* to *eveniant*. But *cosentant* is at least as bold and as uncertain as *responses*, and Leo in his new edition keeps much nearer to the reading of the MSS. by his text *ut illae res? responde*. He accounts for A by supposing it to represent *ostenta pro responde*. I should follow Leo in his text but not in his distribution between the

speakers. It seems clear that *Epidicus* is questioning *Thesprio* about events at Thebes, to which alone *illae res* can refer. Divide then, Thesp. *Quid tibi vis dicam nisi quod est?* Epid. *ut illae res? responde*. Thesp. *probe*. Then *Epidicus* follows the general question *ut illae res?* 'how go things generally at Thebes?' to which *Thesprio* answers *probe*, by the definite enquiry about *Stratipocles*, v. 20, *quid erilis noster filius?*

*Epid.* 625.  
*Ex tuis verbis meum futurum corium pulcrum praedicas.*

In A between *pulcrum* and *praedicas* there is a space for two letters and the word wanted is *ut*. *Ex tuis verbis... ut praedicas* is the regular Plautine idiom and scarcely requires illustration, for a second clause like *ut praedicas* is constantly epexegetic of a phrase like *ex tuis verbis*.

J. H. GRAY.

NOTE ON *ALCESTIS*, 320—322.

CONJECTURAL emendation of the text of ancient classics is permissible, if at all, only where the reading is doubtful or the sense unsatisfactory. Let us apply this canon to Professor Earle's treatment of what he calls the 'crux criticorum' in the *Alcestis* of Euripides:—

δεῖ γὰρ θανεῖν με· καὶ τὸδ' οὐκ ἐς αὔριον  
οὐδ' ἐς τρίτην μοι μὴνὸς ἔρχεται κακόν,  
ἀλλ' αὐτίκ' ἐν τοῖς μῆκετ' οὐσι λέξομαι.

where (in the November number of the *Classical Review*) he proposes to read:—

οὐδ' ἐς τρίτην μοι μὴν ἔσέρχεται κακόν.

It is not claimed that the reading here is doubtful. Is the sense then unsatisfactory?

I suppose it will be admitted that it would be a perfectly natural thing for Alcestis, knowing that she was to die on the day on which she was speaking, to say that the evil was not coming upon her on the morrow nor on the next day, but at once; and further that, if she were

speaking on the first of the month, she might put the third day of the month for the day next but one. It remains then to show that she was speaking on the first day of the month, and that the audience are supposed to know it.

The conception of death as a debt owed by mortals is common in all literature. We need not go further than the same play to find it—

βροτοῖς ἅπασι καθανεῖν ὀφείλεται.

Now this idea was evidently present to the mind of Euripides in the prologue, who there invests the King of Terrors with the odious characteristics of a usurer, whose ways are:—

To mortals hateful and by gods abhorred.

Death, inexorable creditor that he is, comes on the first of the month to claim his due.

ST. GEORGE STOCK.

Oxford.

## MAGICAL PAPYRI.

1. In Mr. Riess's notes, (*Classical Review*, Dec. 1896 p. 410) citing Par. 213—14. (We. i. 51), occurs ἀμφιέσθην λευκοῖς ἱμάσιν. 'But as nobody can dress in straps, we must read εἴμασιν. Still ἱμάσιν might be explained as meaning the narrow linen strips, in which mummies were wrapped.' May the reference not be to the binding of the 'recipient'? Mr. Myers, (*Classical Essays*, p. 88) cites, for this world-wide magical practice, oracles in Eusebius, *Pr. Ev.* 8: 'The recipient was in some way bound with withes, and enveloped in fine linen, which had to be cut and unwrapped at the end of the ceremony.' I have compared the Australian magical usage, 'the head, body, and limbs wound round with stringy bark cords,' and similar usages among the Red Indians.

2. πλῆκται = knocking or rapping ἦρωες = souls, are, of course, still very common. (Par. 1079).

3. Pap. R(ainer) l. 34 ff. ὑποκλοπὴν. Mr. Riess says 'stealthy theft, of what?' and suggests, of babies, changelings being substi-

tuted. Probably the meaning is, theft of portable objects. Many 'cases' will be found in the Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research, and others may be studied in Nevius's *Demon Possession in China*. The objects in haunted houses vanish, and turn up in unlooked for places. Witch Trials, Glanvil, and other sources provide endless examples. These phenomena are so familiar, in modern experience, (of course the trick is easily played) that ὑποκλοπὴ hardly needs another explanation. Mr. Riess will find crowds of instances in an American book of 1888, *The Great Amherst Mystery*. A well observed case is recorded from his own experience, by an eminent Catholic missionary in Tonquin. (circ. 1730). The πνεύματα in a haunted house were throwing stones about. 'Why don't you throw money?' asked a native Christian, and a handful of copper coins, all wet, dropped in the room. On leaving the house, after doing his exorcism, the reverend Father found a water-seller bewailing him-

self in the street. He had lost his money, which he had put in an empty water pitcher. The Father asked him to describe the coins, which were, in fact, the wet ones thrown by the local πνεύματα. If this is not ὑποκλοπή, what is? At a distance from my books, I cannot give the exact reference, but I can procure it.

4. Same citation:—

πνεύματα ἢ κλαίοντα ἢ γελῶντα φοβερὰ, (sic) i.e. γελῶντα φοβερὰ. No need to go to Grimm, Sagen, no. 224! The Wesley case (1716) and Miss Rose Morton's 'Record of a Haunted House' (*Proceedings*, S. P. R.) will supply πνεύματα κλαίοντα. For γελῶντα

φοβερὰ I can provide an instance. The house and lands of an ancient family were sold, some thirty years ago, and purchased by acquaintances of my own. The local πνεῦμα always laughed horribly at the death of the squire. My friends, being new people, expected no such thing, but, when their father died, the πνεῦμα 'laughed consumedly,' as they told me.

Πνεύματα have learned nothing, and forgotten nothing, since the *Magical Papyri* were written. They should be edited by a Mage, or, at all events, by somebody who knows the modern parallels.

ANDREW LANG.

#### DEBATE IN THE SENATE, AS TO THE RESTORATION OF PTOLEMY AULETES, A.U.C 698 (B.C. 56)

'PROXIMA erat Hortensii sententia, cum Lupus, tribunus pl., quod ipse de Pompeio retulisset, intendere coepit, ante se oportere discissionem facere quam consules. Eius orationi vehementer ab omnibus reclamatum est; erat enim et iniqua et nova. Consules neque concedebant, neque valde repugnabant, diem consumi volebant; id quod est factum: perspiciebant enim in Hortensii sententiam multis partibus plures ituros, quamquam aperte Volcatio adsentirentur. Multi rogabantur, atque id ipsum consulibus invitis; nam ii Bibuli sententiam valere cupierunt.'

Cic. *Ad. Fam.* I. 2. § 2.

The traditional interpretation refers *ii* to *consulibus*; this makes *invitis* difficult, for if the consuls wished to waste the day, because their own inclinations were for the motion of Bibulus, the course which they took would suit their purpose very well. It would not matter which side the *multi* supported, in that case, because the day would be wasted, as the consuls wished it to be. Hence many editors read *consulibus non invitis*, but there is no authority for the insertion *non*.

I propose to refer *ii* to *multi*. Grammatically, if there is any difference between the two interpretations, it is slightly in favour of the latter, but in Cicero's epistolary Latin, this cannot be insisted upon. The situation in the Senate, I interpret as follows: the consuls were at the very beginning of their year of office, and were rather feeling their way in the Egyptian question. The one thing certain in their

minds was a desire not to offend Pompeius, as they were nearly sure to do, if they allowed the matter to be pressed to a further division. Hence they wanted to waste time—*diem consumi volebant*—and this they did by asking for *sententiae* on the demand of Lupus. But this very course—*id ipsum*—though the only one possible, with a view to wasting time, the consuls pursued reluctantly—*invitis*—because the senators, who thus gave their *sententiae*, let it be seen at the same time that they were strongly in favour of the proposal of Bibulus. This can be supported from *Ad. Fam.* I. 1 § 3. *Huic* (i.e. *Bibulo*) *adsentirentur reliqui consulares, praeter Servilium... et Volcatium... et Afranium*. The consuls would naturally be asked first, and would, as a whole, be for the proposal of Bibulus. Their assertion of this fact would be unwelcome to the consuls, both because it would tend to force the matter to a division, and because this support of an already rejected motion would confuse the consuls as to the general inclinations of the senate. And if the force of *multi* be pressed, I am inclined to think that the Senate were so uncertain in their intentions, that, once the lead was given, they would rather speak in favour of an already rejected motion, than give open support to any other motion as yet undecided, while the wishes of Pompeius were so uncertain as Cicero represents them to have been.

The sentence preceding the one under discussion, *perspiciebant enim... adsentirentur*, must be considerably discounted. Cicero is



here writing to Lentulus Spinther; but in a letter to Quintus (*Ad. Quint. Fratr.* II. 2) written only two days later, he says, *Sine dubio res a Lentulo remota videtur esse.*

It is unfortunate that the wishes of the consuls cannot be accurately discovered. Lentulus Marcellinus later on in this year opposed Pompeius, but the fact that Cicero mentions this as his one objection to Marcellinus (*Ad. Quint. Fratr.* II. 4. § 5) would seem to show that it was rather a sudden development, and that at the beginning of the year, at any rate, Marcellinus was not against Pompeius (cf. Drumann. Vol. II. sub 'Claudii Marcelli' no. 31). Marcii Philippus is still more an unknown quantity. He was deliberately passed over, on the

assignment of provinces in 49 B.C. (Caesar *B.C.* I. 6), and would therefore seem to have been insignificant in politics: he tried to dissuade Octavius from entering on his inheritance (Velleius Paterculus, II. 60, Suet. *Aug.* 8 Appian *B.C.* III 10, 13, cf. *Cic. ad Att.* XIV. 12) and disgraced himself when sent as ambassador to Antony at Mutina (*Cic. Ad Fam.* XII. 4, *Phil.* VIII 10, IX. I.) and would therefore seem to have been hesitating, cautious, and incompetent.

If the reference of *ii* to *multi* is satisfactory from a political point of view, it may perhaps be of some use, as obviating the necessity of inserting *non* before *invitis*.

R. H. GRETTON.

Magdalen College, Oxford.

#### ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF *οὐ μὴ*.

IN the April number of this review, I ventured to criticise Prof. Goodwin's view of the construction *οὐ μὴ*, basing my objections (i) on usage and (ii) on meaning. As my criticism was confined to a particular theory, questions (such as whether *μὴ* after *δεῖω* is interrogative) which would not affect the validity of my argument whichever way they may be decided, were left in abeyance, nor was more than a passing reference made to the double negative theory of *οὐ μὴ* + *Fut.* I agreed with Prof. Goodwin wherever possible, in order to emphasise the fact that even on his own premises his theory is untenable. To this method Mr. Whitelaw has taken exception. He justly objects to an explanation, with which he is satisfied, being dismissed as 'very improbable,' 'unphilosophical' or 'absurd' without further argument; and though personally I am only guilty of using the first and mildest of these epithets, I should certainly not have employed it without arguments in justification, had I known that this theory, which I had long believed obsolete, still claimed adherents. With such apology by way of introduction, I propose now to examine the theory as expounded by Mr. Whitelaw. In his own words it is thus briefly stated '*οὐ μὲν*; = *μὲν*,' (therefore) '*οὐ μὴ μὲν*; = *μὴ μὲν*' (p. 239a). (i) But why is the combination *οὐ μὴ* and not *οὐκ οὐ*? Mr. Whitelaw offers no explanation; does he hold the view that since *οὐκ ἔστι*; = is it not so? therefore *οὐ μὴ ἔστι*; will mean 'is it so'? I suppose he does; or if not, what limitations does he lay down to the possibility of

double negatives? I can imagine none, unless he supposes that the *μὴ* is due to false analogy with the *μὴ* in *μὴ μὲν*. But it is hardly probable that scholars will be prepared to shift so heavy a burden on the already well-laden back of 'false analogy.' I am of course not unaware that attempts have been made to explain this *μὴ* on other lines, but it does not appear that Mr. Whitelaw would accept such explanations. For instance Dr. Verrall in a note on Aesch. Sept. 236, says that 'a sensitive ear' requires the change; a double *οὐ* was also objectionable for grammatical reasons and so *μὴ* was substituted. From Dr. Verrall's note one would suppose that there was dire necessity compelling the Greeks to adopt a construction of the 'will you not not-talk,' type, and that as their sensitive ears revolted at the double *οὐ*, aesthetic taste got the better of grammar and they substituted *μὴ* for the second *οὐ*. I cannot agree with this view. 'Will you not not-talk' sentences do not appear to me indispensable in any language. So cumbrous a form of sentence would never, I believe, have even occurred to the Greek mind, certainly it is unlikely that grammar would have been sacrificed in an effort to retain it. For after all, if I wish to negative 'it is not raining,' I simply say 'it is raining,' and similarly the negative of *οὐ περιώψεθέ με*; (Leave me alone) is not *οὐ μὴ* or *οὐκ οὐ περιώψεθέ με*; but simply *περιώψεθέ με*; (Don't leave me alone). Scepticism on this point may be removed by reference to Ar. Ach. 55.

(ii) Mr. Whitelaw admits that 'if it were

proved that οὐ μὴ λαλήσῃς could be used in the prohibitive sense,' (p. 239b) his theory would break down. But 'Prof. Goodwin quotes only two examples of this' (p. 240a) which remind Mr. Whitelaw of stage armies. Though Prof. Goodwin confined himself to two instances, it will be found on reference to any critical edition of Aristophanes that in all cases but one, the vast majority, and in some cases, the whole body of MSS prefer the Aor. to the Fut. form, in those passages where both are metrically possible. It is a real army of facts and not a stage army which is arrayed against Mr. Whitelaw. Moreover it is impossible to admit his argument that if in Ar. Nub. 296 ποιήσεις was incorrectly written ποιήσῃς, 'this would necessitate the further error of σκώψῃς for σκώψει' (p. 240a). Consistency is nothing accounted of among scribes; for example in Ar. Nub. 505 the one instance of MSS. preponderating in favour of ἀκολουθήσεις (not ῃς), there is an equally strong preponderance of the same MSS. in favour of the coordinated λαλήσῃς (not εἰς) in the same line. Therefore I cannot but feel that the MSS. σκώψῃς is inexplicable, except on the supposition that it is correct.

For these reasons I find no difficulty in agreeing with Prof. Goodwin and Prof. Jebb in regarding a theory which offers no explanation of the μὴ and pays no respect to MSS. authority as both 'unphilosophical' and 'absurd.'

Although it does not appear necessary in view of the foregoing argument to examine in detail Mr. Whitelaw's evidence, it is perhaps worth pointing out that one of the three crutches by which he attempts to support his view is a broken reed. The strength of his argument consists, he says, of a number of sentences of three forms, one of which called C. is as follows οὐ μὴ μενείῃς, ἀλλ' ἀπέῃ, μηδὲ λαλήσεις (e.g. Bacch. 343). What, he asks a little later, is to be done with sentences of this form? But there are no sentences of this form. There is one sentence, and only one, (Bacch. 343) which approximates to it, having δὲ and not ἀλλὰ in the middle clause, which makes a considerable difference in respect to the probability of the parenthesis theory. Of course if sentences of this (supposed) type were found, Mr. Whitelaw's theory would gain a greater degree of likelihood, because frequent use of parenthesis in such sentences would be improbable, but the actual absence of such sentences is, if anything, an argument against his view.

Turning to Mr. Whitelaw's criticism of

my paper, and his own view of οὐ μὴ in denials, I wish to remove a misconception. He says (p. 242b) 'I cannot think that Mr. Chambers' view that μὴ with independent subj. in Homer has never parted with its prohibitive force will find acceptance.' So far from propounding a new theory for the acceptance of scholars, I was merely quoting the already accepted view of Mr. Monro, the greatest authority on the subject, who never translates μὴ + indep. subj. other than prohibitively.

Dividing my criticism as before into (i) usage and (ii) meaning, I have in reference to (i) only to repeat my statement that if any one of the existing instances of cautious statements be negated by prefixing οὐ, or if any one of the existing instances of οὐ μὴ be made affirmative by the omission of οὐ, a construction is produced in support of which no instances can be adduced. Mr. Whitelaw says the second part of this criticism is accidentally true, and the first untrue; and he proceeds to quote an example of οὐ μὴ οὐ from Thucyd. II 93. The quotation, if I may thus call a loose paraphrase, is not to the point. No editor to whom I have access, and I have consulted most of the leading commentators, German and English, takes the passage in the way Mr. Whitelaw proposes. I cannot think that Mr. Whitelaw is justified in contradicting a statement of mine which was based on a most careful search and thus practically accusing me of the gross carelessness of neglecting to look through such an author as Thucydides, on what ground? Merely on the interpretation which he and he alone puts on one solitary passage.<sup>1</sup> If however the fact that the two constructions are never interchangeable in the way described is merely an accident, I am content to rest my case wholly on the second objection, viz. that grounded on meaning.

(ii) Herein I am encouraged by the fact that Mr. Whitelaw thinks I have 'successfully exposed' a similar weakness in Prof. Goodwin's view, to turn the same weapons against Mr. Whitelaw himself. According to the theory under review, the history of the meaning of μὴ is that it is 'a "not" which avoids assertion,' expressing a mental misgiving, from which it acquired a new meaning of 'perhaps' or possibly' and finally the sentence becomes an assertion of possibility. This possibility is negated by οὐ and a strong denial is the result. Plausi-

<sup>1</sup> The passage from Philebus 12 D has obviously no bearing on my statement; I cannot understand why it has been quoted.

ble as this sounds, a moment's thought reveals that it is a mere piece of jugglery with the word 'possibly.' Let us take an instance; *μὴ διαφθείρη* perhaps she will destroy, she will [possibly destroy, *οὐ μὴ διαφθείρη* she will not possibly destroy, she cannot destroy. In the first, the 'possibly' is subjective, the speaker expresses personal mental misgiving, apprehension, avoidance of assertion etc.; in the second the 'possibly' is objective, the speaker denies the capability of some one else to perform an action. The ambiguity could only arise with a word like the English 'possibly' which bears two perfectly distinct meanings. So far Prof. Goodwin and Mr. Whitelaw fare alike, but Mr. Whitelaw takes a second plunge into the slough, which Prof. Goodwin had carefully avoided. 'The *οὐ*,' says Mr. Whitelaw, 'does negative a word of apprehension,' (p. 241b) it negatives 'simply and solely the adverb *μὴ*,' (p. 242a) which as he tells us elsewhere means 'perhaps.' There can be no harm therefore in substituting one adverb for another, if they are synonymous. Let us therefore in (e.g.) Crito

44 B. substitute *ἴσως* for *μὴ* and thus obtain *οἷον ἐγὼ οὐδένα ἴσως ποτὲ εὐρήσω*. The only possible translation of this is 'I shall perhaps never see his like again,' but the original undoubtedly means 'I certainly shall not.' It is obvious and requires no further demonstration that the *οὐ* could only negative 'simply and solely' the *μὴ*, if it was always the word immediately preceding the *μὴ* and further was never compounded. Negatives negative individual words with which they are closely joined, or clauses; they cannot negative some word picked out arbitrarily anywhere in the sentence.

In conclusion, I am quite ready to grant that no theory of *οὐ μὴ* is completely satisfactory; sentences of the class of Soph. Aj. 75 do present difficulties to the view to which I am myself inclined. My object in the original paper was not so much to set up any theory of my own, as to urge the rejection of one widely accepted doctrine, which in my opinion was educationally detrimental, being founded on a confusion of thought.

C. D. CHAMBERS.

#### ON THE MEANING OF *AD* IN *AD OPIS* AND SIMILAR EXPRESSIONS.

THE question raised in this number by Miss Sellers in the interesting review of Bornecque's work, may perhaps be most readily answered by an assembly of passages which I have gathered for comparison. These will, I think, show that an invariable distinction between *ad Opis* and *in aede Opis* cannot be maintained even for Ciceronian usage, though it is likely that it was observed by careful writers in speaking of such matters as the position of statues.

We have a number of passages in Cicero referring to the treasure in the temple of Ops, seized by Antony after Caesar's death. The passage cited by Miss Sellers (*Phil.* i. 7, 17) stands on the same ground as *Phil.* ii. 14, 35 'qui maximo te aere alieno ad Opis liberasti,' and *ad Att.* xiv. 14, 5 'Rapinas scribis ad Opis fieri.' It can hardly be doubted that the place in question was inside some building, not in the open air; and it might be suggested that, inasmuch as we know little about the temple of Ops we may assume the treasury to have been an annex to the temple and therefore to be described as 'ad Opis.'

But this idea becomes untenable upon a

comparison of the following passages: *Phil.* ii. 37, 93 'ubi est septies millies sestertium, quod in tabulis quae sunt ad Opis patebat'; *Phil.* viii. 9, 26 'Ne tangantur rationes ad Opis, id est ne septies millies recuperetur'; *Phil.* v. 6, 15 'direptio eius pecuniae cuius ratio in aede Opis confecta est.' It is surely impossible that the place designated by *in aede Opis* in the last passage can be different from that which is designated by *ad Opis* in the two preceding.

The same apparent possibility of using *ad* [*aedem*] and *in* [*aede*] with no practical difference of meaning comes out in another class of examples which refer to meetings of the Senate: for what distinction can be traced in the following passages: *Phil.* i. 13, 31 'in aede Telluris senatus fuit'; *ad Att.* xvi. 14, 'multo firmitus acta tyranni comprobata iri quam in Telluris'; *ad Q. Fr.* ii. 3 'Senatus ad Apollinis fuit?' The meeting was, no doubt, within the building; but a conventional use of *ad* is allowed,

<sup>1</sup> It is strange, by the way, that no grammar, as far as I know, mentions the use of the elliptic genitive following *in*, and the rules are worded as if it were used only after *ad*.

corresponding to the use of *ad villam* of persons at home in their country house 'ad villam est Tullius' (*pro Tull.* 20).

And in this liberty of choice Livy concurs. Compare the following: xxiv. 43 'Iis extra urbem in aede Apollinis senatus datus est'; xxvi. 21, 'Senatus ad Bellonae datus est' (so also xxx. 21, xxxiii. 24); xxxi. 47, 'Senatum in aede Bellonae habuit'; xxxix. 4, 'ad aedem Apollinis in senatu quum...disseruisset'; xli. 17, 'senatus in aede Apollinis legatorum verbis auditis.'

The conclusion which seems to me to follow the consideration of these passages is that *ad*, in the expression *ad Opis*, etc., corresponds to our use of *at* in similar connexion; and that it was probably used with much the same limitations: i.e. just as we can say, 'there was a debate *at* St. Stephen's' or '*in* St. Stephen's'; so-and-so preached '*at* St. Paul's' or '*in* St. Paul's'; the accounts can be inspected '*at* the Bank of England' or '*in* the Bank of England,' so *ad* (strictly, like the English *at*, implying 'in the neighbourhood of') can be used conventionally, where the sense is plain, with an accusative or with the elliptic genitives *Opis*, *Apollinis*, etc. to describe the place of meetings, etc. within the temples, and not *merely* for something which went on near them.

But there is a limitation usually observed in the use of the English preposition. We should say 'there is a monument of Nelson in St. Paul's' not 'at St. Paul's'; and I am inclined to think that, for the same reason (i.e. for greater precision, where there might be a misunderstanding), there is a similar limitation in the use of *ad*, and that when a statue, for instance, is described as being 'ad Opis' it is defined as standing beside it, not inside.

A passage of the *Verres* (iv. 16, 36) seems to fall in with this conjecture: 'Domus plena signorum...multa ad villas tuas posita.' The statues would almost certainly be inside the town house, but they well might be in the gardens of the country house; and I think it fairly safe to conclude that the statues mentioned in the letter *ad Q. Fr.* iii. 1, 14, 'ad Telluris tuam statuam locavi'; in *ad Att.* vi. 1, 7, 'ea statua quae ad Opis per te

posita in excelso' (if that is the right reading), and those which Marcellus placed 'ad aedem Honoris et Virtutis' (*Verr.* iv. 54, 121) were all outside the temples.

The usage of Pliny tends to strengthen this surmise, for there is, I think, some indication that he is precise in the localisation of statues. Let us take the two chapters about bronze and marble statues, from which Miss Sellers has cited some examples. The various statues whose place is mentioned are thus located by Pliny: 'in Campo Martio,' 'in Capitolio,' 'in bibliotheca templi Augusti,' 'ante Martis Ultoris aedem,' 'in Parthenone' (of the Athene), 'in Titi imperatoris atrio,' 'apud Circum Maximum in aede Pompei Magni,' 'ad aedem Fortunae,' 'ante Thermas [Agrippae],' 'Trophonii ad oraculum,' 'ante Felicitatis aedem,' 'in aede Concordiae,' 'ante aedem Jovis tonantis,' 'in Concordiae templo,' 'in templo Pacis,' 'juxta rostra' (xxxiv. §§ 40-93), 'in Palatina aede Apollinis in fastigio,' 'Athenis in Ceramicio,' 'in hortis Servilianis,' 'in Palati delubro,' 'intra Octaviae porticus in Junonis aede,' 'delubro Cn. Domiti in circo Flaminio,' 'in templo Bruti Callaeci,' 'in templo Apollinis Sosiani,' 'in Curia Octaviae,' 'in Saepthis,' 'in Palatio Apollinis delubro,' 'Ephesi in templo Dianae post aedem,' 'ad Octaviae porticum in delubro [Apollinis],' 'ad aedem Felicitatis,' 'in columnis templi eius [Panthei]' (xxxvi. §§ 11-39).

It seems a fair inference that, although, in speaking of assemblies of the Senate, etc., where there is no risk of ambiguity, *ad aedem* and *in aede* are interchangeable, yet in the case of statues, which could be placed either inside or outside, it may be assumed that when Pliny (or Cicero) says *ad*, he does not mean inside; and it is not unlikely that he is precise also in his use of *ante* for 'in front of' and *ad* for 'beside' or near.

It is possible that some scholar, who has made a more exhaustive and careful examination of authorities (*inter alia*, of inscriptions) than I have had time to make for this note, may be able to throw further light upon the question.

G. E. MARINDIN.



JEBB'S *AJAX*.

THE first feeling of all who care for Greek as they turn the pages of this volume must be one of lively satisfaction that Prof. Jebb has been enabled to see the end of his fourteen years' labour on Sophocles' extant plays. With another volume, containing the fragments, this great edition will be complete. But though the fragments, in Prof. Jebb's accomplished hands, will be by no means wanting in interest and instruction to the special student, there will naturally be less scope for many of the qualities that constitute the peculiar distinction of this editor's work. It is the rare combination of knowledge, accuracy, and judgment, with literary subtlety, poetic insight, and lucid and cogent exposition, which have made Prof. Jebb so masterly an interpreter of this great poet and finest of artists.

The Introduction is unusually elaborate and interesting. The history of the myth, with its early and intricate variations, is traced from Homer downwards. Much ingenuity is shown in the reconstruction of Aeschylus' trilogy on the subject, from scattered fragments, scholia, and chance mentions in other authors. Here Prof. Jebb is able to use the labours of other scholars, notably Welcker: but his own contributions are not insignificant. Particularly (for example) he notices the emphasis and detail (in Sophocles' play) with which both chorus and Aias dwell on the grief which Eriboia will feel at her son's death; and suggests that here we have a reference to κορμοὶ in Aeschylus' third play, 'The Salaminian Women,' where the very title points to the importance of Eriboia's part.

But the main interest of the introduction lies in the new light thrown on the old questions, 'Does not the modern reader feel the prolongation of the play after the hero's death to be an anticlimax?', and, 'Must not the ancient spectator have felt the same?' The ordinary answers lay stress on the importance to a Greek mind of burial: but Prof. Jebb contends with much force that more than this is required if the poet is to be completely justified. Substantially his view may thus be summarized: to the modern reader, Aias is only a man, whose tragic fortunes and suicide form the real drama; while, to the Athenian spectator, he was also a sacred national hero,

worshipped with divine honours. Thus the human interest, which to us is everything, was to them necessarily second to the religious interest, which made his *burial* and not his *death* the real climax. For (in a word) the centre of the hero-cult is the tomb; and before he can become *χθόνιος* he must at least be honourably buried.

Prof. Jebb further argues that the Cambridge representation in 1882 showed the play capable of 'holding an audience.' There is no doubt that individual spectators were surprised to find how well the interest was sustained after Aias' death: the hero's body lying on the stage, the weeping wife and child, the generous pleading of the friend and brother—these visible tokens of the real issue certainly affected the minds of those who watched the scene more powerfully than any but the most imaginative are touched by reading the words. But the verdict of an audience so artificial, so imperfectly following, and so pledged to approval, cannot be really felt to carry much weight—even if there were any certain means of arriving at it.

The text of the Aias is, on the whole, perhaps sounder than that of any other play of Sophocles: but there are a few serious corruptions and several minor difficulties to deal with. Prof. Jebb rejects three lines (554, 571, and 1417) where interpolation is obvious and generally allowed. Against the murderous excisions of Nauck, who blacks out Sophocles like a Russian censor (condemning fifty-nine lines altogether in this play), he makes as usual a firm stand. In this last volume he 'is thankful to observe a reaction setting in' against such reckless mutilation; and the reader will certainly credit the fine taste and sane judgment of this editor with no small share in this reaction. His own emendations in this play are few. We may mention τοιοῦτ' ὁμοῦ πέλας for τοῖσδ' (405), an extremely simple alteration which sets the metre right, and is decidedly preferable to Lobeck's more ingenious τίς δ' ὁμοῦ πέλαι, where the order of thought is harshly broken. In 869 the Hemichorion searching for Aias are reported by the MSS. as saying:—

πᾶ γὰρ οὐκ ἔβαν ἐγώ;  
κοῦδεῖς ἐπίσταται με συμμαθεῖν τόπος.

i.e. 'Where have I not been? And no place

is aware that I share its knowledge [where he is].'

This is rather too obscure for a simple sailor, even in a Sophoclean lyric: and the editor suggests σφε συνναίειν for με συμμαθεῖν, i.e. 'no place knows that he is there,' which is certainly an improvement in sense.

In all the corrupt places where the corrections of previous scholars are adopted, the grounds are stated with a precision and fulness which, amid the bewildering multitude of conjectures, are most helpful, and which frequently throw new light on the difficulty. Thus on the well-known passage (601):—

παλαιὸς ἀφ' οὗ χρόνος  
ἰδαία μίμων λειμώνι ποίαι μῆλων  
ἀνὴρ ἱθὺς αἰὲν εὐνόμα. (The reading of L.)

we have an admirable statement, unfortunately too long to quote, justifying the adoption of the following compound correction from Lobeck, Hermann, and Bergk:—

Ἰδαία μίμων λειμώνι ἔπαντα μνηῶν  
ἀνὴρ ἱθὺς αἰὲν εὐνόμα.

In 1281 [where Teukros is replying to Agamemnon's empty boast that Aias was not so remarkable after all—ποῦ βάντος ἢ ποῦ στάντος οὐπερ οὐκ ἐγώ;] the MSS. give:—

ὃν οὐδαμοῦ φῆς οὐδὲ συμβῆναι ποδί,

which was not at all what Agamemnon had said, even if it is good Greek. Prof. Jebb adopts the most ingenious conjecture of J. Krauss:—

ὃν οὐδαμοῦ φῆς, οὐ σὺ μὲν βῆναι ποδί,

which is an accurate quotation of Agamemnon's taunt, and extremely near the MSS. text.

Two well-known passages remain where there is at least *prima facie* ground to suspect interpolation. These are (1) Aias' curse on the Atreidae (839-42), and (2) Teukros' reference to Hektor (1030) as 'gripped by the girdle to the chariot-rail and mangled till he breathed out his life.' The first passage runs as follows:—

καὶ σφας κακοὺς κάκιστα καὶ πανωλέθρους  
ξυναρπάσειαν, ὥσπερ εἰσορῶσ' ἐμὲ  
αὐτοσφαγὴ πίπτοντα, τῶς αὐτοσφαγεῖς  
πρὸς τῶν φιλόστων ἐγόνων ὀλοῖοτο.

No one defends the last two lines: for τῶς is not Sophoclean, φιλόστων is not a Greek word, Agamemnon was not slain by his son, and Menelaos 'lived happily ever after.' The critics are divided between those who reject all four lines (Dindorf, Cobet, and others) and those who follow Bothe and Hermann in rejecting only the last two. Prof. Jebb argues with much ingenuity in favour of the latter, on the two grounds that the scholiast, properly interpreted, rather supports the genuineness of the two first lines, and that the curse on the army, which follows, would be too abrupt unless the Atreidae had been cursed previously. These points deserve consideration; but perhaps the editor has rather overlooked the weakness of ending the sentence with ὥσπερ εἰσορῶσ' ἐμὲ, leaving the important idea (ξυναρπάσθεται) understood. I would even urge that Prof. Jebb feels this himself: for (by a suggestive inadvertence) the words 'even as they behold me' are included in the interpolation, both on p. 131 in the translation and again in the introduction on p. xxxix.

In the second passage (1030) the editor's defence will probably be felt to be successful, in spite of the grave difficulty that the story contradicts the very climax of the *Iliad*. Particularly noticeable is the subtle and true distinction he draws (Appendix, 235) between an elaborate narrative conflicting with Homer, which would be improbable, and an incidental reference involving a different story, which is conceivable. He might have added that the lines themselves, with their powerful and finished phrasing, remind one much more of Sophocles than of the interpolator.

One line which is certainly corrupt (799):—

τήνδε δ' ἔξοδον  
ὀλεθρίαν Αἴαντος ἐλπίζει φέρειν

Prof. Jebb leaves unaltered (and even unobelized) in the text, though he pronounces it impossible. He follows Blaydes' emendation ὀλεθρον εἰς Αἴαντος, though preferring the other order (Αἴ. ε. δ.). It may, however, be argued that Blaydes' order better accounts for the corruption. In any case the corrupt line should disappear from the text.

With regard to interpretation, and verbal and grammatical comment, there is in this volume a mass of careful and instructive work; but we have only space for a few select specimens, including some where we venture to differ from the editor.

By far the finest example in the book of acute and telling criticism is the long discussion (in the introduction, p. xxxii.) on the last speech of Aias to Tekmessa (646—692). Between the opposed opinions, that it is 'all dissembling,' and that there 'is no intention to mislead,' Prof. Jebb takes an intermediate view. We can only here say that even those who differ from the conclusion will recognize the illuminating insight and power with which the case is put.

On the beautiful yet difficult lines (475-6):—

τί γὰρ παρ' ἡμᾶρ ἡμέρα τέρπειν ἔχει  
προσθεῖσα κ' ἀναθεῖσα τοῦ γε καθυίνειν

we have an admirably full and clear explanation in the notes: but perhaps the poignant pathos, the magical expression of despair, is too much lost in the overliteral translation. It is a hard matter to compete with Prof. Jebb in translation: but would it not be here better to aim at a terser and simpler paraphrase such as the following:—

For where is the joy of day following day—  
now nearer—and now farther—when the  
end is death?

On 651, βαφή σιδηρὸς ὥς, ἐθελύνθην στόμα, the editor supports the common interpretation 'like iron *hardened* in the dipping.' Readers of the *C.R.* will remember that the passage was discussed in a former number (Nov. 1890) by Mr. G. E. Marindin, who gave strong reasons for this interpretation. The solution of the scholiast, that hard iron was sometimes *softened* in an oilbath, (adopted by Mr. Whitelaw in his excellent translation) seems difficult to maintain in the face of the common use of βαφή, and the practical proof by the specialist, R. Paehler, that oil has *not* that effect. The objection to the common interpretation has always been the awkward dative βαφῇ, and the order of the words, which connects the simile better with ἐθελύνθην than with ἐκαπτέρουν. These difficulties are forcibly urged by Mr. Whitelaw in reply to Mr. Marindin (*C.R.* Feb. 1891), and it must be confessed that Prof. Jebb has not completely removed them.

In noting the grammar points the editor is unailing, and he often gives admirable and lucid explanations. Nothing could be better than his proof (against Goodwin) of the interrogative use of οὐ μή (75, appendix); it is only regrettable that his argument is confined to compound instances (of mixed

commands and prohibitions), and is not extended to simple cases of interrogative οὐ μή. If you can say οὐ μή προσοίσεις χεῖρα (in the sense 'Won't you *not* bring your hand here?') i.e. *Don't*) when it is followed by βακχεύσεις δ' ἰών, then obviously you can (and the Greeks habitually do) use the same form alone. We wish Prof. Jebb would look a little further, and wholly reinstate the sound theory of Elmsley, which has latterly been struggling for existence against the great (and otherwise amply deserved) authority of Goodwin.

We have a good note on τὸν μὲν ἦστο πλείστον ..χρόνον (311): but we should like to see it clearly stated that the order is *Erpic*, like τὰ δ' ἐπώχετο κῆλα θεοῖο. [So *Agam.* 1056, τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἐστίας μεσομφάλου ἐστήκεν ἡδὴ μῆλα....] The two optatives, χρεών...εἰ πάθοι (521) οὐ δίκαιον...εἰ θάνοι (1344), are correctly explained and illustrated: but it is not sufficient to say that they 'mark the generality' of the statement, since the main point, the breach of *sequence*, is not adverted to. The editor should have quoted cases where such optatives follow verbs (expressed or understood) in *primary* tenses, as *O.T.* 979, εἰκὴ κράτιστον ζῆν ὅπως δύναιτό τις; and *O.T.* 315, *Antig.* 666. The well-known violation of usage, ὁ λυμένων ἐμὸς (573) is instructively noted: but there is an error in the reference to *Electra* 133, τὸν ἐμὸν πατέρα' ἄθλιον, which is simply a case of the 'Divided Attribute,' and is perfectly normal. On 1082, ταύτην νόμιζε τὴν πόλιν...πεσεῖν, Prof. Jebb adheres to his strange explanation of πεσεῖν as 'gnomic,' a usage necessarily, it seems to us, confined to the indicative. On the other hand, the aorist (and present) infinitive is normal in Greek after verbs of expectation, promise, and prophesy. Some instances are given by Prof. Jebb himself in the appendix to the *Electra* 442, to which he here refers; and there are several more, e.g. *Protag.* 316 C, τοῦτο οἶεταί οἱ μάλιστα γενέσθαι εἰ σοὶ συγγένοιτο, *Eur. Or.* 1527, μῶρος εἰ δοκεῖς με πλῆναι, *Ar. Vesp.* 177, τὸν ἄνον ἐξάγειν δοκῶ, *ib.* 159, ὁ θεός..ἐχρησεν...ἀποσκληῖναι τότε, etc. The editor abandons this natural explanation, on the plea there is not sufficient 'help from the context'; but χρόνῳ ποτὲ is all that is needed to show that νόμιζε...πεσεῖν refers to the future, and means 'expect it...to fall.'

One much disputed line (966) Prof. Jebb leaves standing, but explains in a way difficult to accept. We believe he is right to reject the emendations proposed, and still more the varied rearrangements sug-

gested. The line occurs in Tekmessa's last and most pathetic utterance. The context is 'Let them mock...one day they will long for him, in the stress of battle...unwise men know not the good till they have lost it': then comes abruptly:—

ἐμοὶ πικρὸς τέθηκεν ἡ κείνοις γλυκὺς,  
αὐτῷ δὲ τερπνός.

The editor translates 'To my pain hath he died *more than* for their joy.' To understand *μᾶλλον* is surely impossible; and the common Homeric use of *βούλομαι*...*ἥ* gives no support to this view, as the verb of choice is there expressed. Why should not

the abruptness be dramatic: 'Bitter to me his death, or sweet to them—but to himself 'tis joy.' She pauses, and the pause is eloquent: she dismisses alike her own grief, and his enemies' malignant triumph, in the thought that he has found peace. For the form, compare *Od.* iv. 409, οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν, ζῶει ὅγ' ἡ τέθηκε.

But enough. These criticisms are nearly all on small points which could be amended (or defended) in the next edition. Of the Sophocles as a whole we can only add our mite to the general verdict of scholars, who place it in the first rank of extant editions of the classics.

A. S.

#### VAN OORDT ON PLATO AND HIS TIMES.

*Plato and the Times he Lived in.* By J. W. G. VAN OORDT. Oxford, 1895. 8s. 6d. net.

MR. VAN OORDT has written a fresh and vigorous essay on a well-worn subject. He rightly holds that 'even in our days it may be of some use to study ancient Greece and her heroes in the field of politics and literature, especially in those parts of the world where another and better condition of affairs can still be brought about than that now witnessed in the old seats of European civilisation.' This sentence reminds us that the author is a member of the Cape of Good Hope University Council. His sketch is a tribute not only to the influence exercised by Plato's philosophy upon Christian thought, but also to Greece herself as the great civilising power of the world. The work is imbued with a warm sympathy for democratic Athens and the author is thoroughly acquainted with the public life of the time. By way of introduction he discusses the age of the poets, from Homer to Aristophanes, the wisdom of the great legislators and earliest philosophers, Solon, Thales, Pythagoras; next, what he calls the tragedy of Greek history, the rise and decline of the Athenian state from the reforms of Clisthenes to the ruin of the Sicilian expedition; then, more fully, the character and fate of Socrates, and the reasons why Aristophanes selected him as a representative of the tendencies which he considered subversive of moral and social order. Amongst the many bold and trenchant remarks in these introductory chapters are

some novel suggestions which hardly commend themselves: e.g. p. 19 sqq. as to the reason for oligarchical intrigues before the battle of Tanagra. It seems hardly probable that, at a time when Athens itself garrisoned Megara (Thuc. 1. 103), any Athenian party can have foreseen the invasion of Attica in 445 B.C. or 431 B.C., or, again, that Pericles (p. 21) adopted the policy of interference in Boeotia and central Greece (457-447 B.C.) against his better judgment in order momentarily to pacify the opponents of the Long Walls. We should incline to believe that in 461 young Athens, with Pericles at its head, deliberately made a bid for the headship of Greece by land and sea, intending to bring Corinth and Aegina down to the level of Miletus and Rhodes. The attempt may have been virtually repeated thirty years later: but it is doubtful whether at that time Pericles could have averted the Peloponnesian war by concessions, as Mr. Evelyn Abbott seems to think.

There is another matter which calls for more serious consideration. Mr. Van Oordt speaks of the Platonic, or rather Socratic, ideas (the italics are our own). We cannot attribute so much intellectual ability to the historical Socrates as to endorse this phrase. That any one should have proposed such a solution of that standing problem, the difference between Socrates as seen by Plato and Socrates as seen by Xenophon, is startling at first sight, almost incredible; and, lest we should be charged with misrepresenting our author, we proceed to justify the asser-



tion made. Where he first offers this surmise (p. 39) it is with some diffidence. But the suggestion recurs (p. 113): 'the beginning of the *Parmenides* leaves no doubt that Socrates, although in Xenophon's Reminiscences not a word is said about ideas in the Platonic sense of the word, must have discussed the ideas with those of his friends whose brains fitted them for philosophical speculation.' Later on we are told that 'this doctrine' [that the human soul is immortal] 'was evidently as much one taught by Socrates to, and discussed with, such scholars of his as he thought fit for philosophical research as that of the ideas mentioned in the *Parmenides* and so many other Platonic dialogues' (p. 166). Again, on p. 255: 'to Socrates—the true Platonic Socrates, whom Xenophon never knew . . . Plato owes two leading doctrines of his philosophy, that of the ideas and that of learning being remembering, in other words that of an immortality of the individual soul on the basis laid down by Pythagoras. Whether or not Socrates arrived at the conception of ideas by himself is not quite clear from the passage in the *Parmenides* (p. 130 B) where he is asked this question; and when in the *Phaedo* (p. 100 B), he states that, after having found no satisfaction in the doctrine of Anaxagoras, he had reverted to those things generally talked about (πολυθρύλητα) . . . it is evident that Plato does not consider the doctrine to have originated with him.' Neither the interpretation of πολυθρύλητα (see *Phaedo* 76 D, ἀθροισμένον αἰεί) nor the inference in the last clause will pass unchallenged by the majority of Platonists who hold that the Platonic Socrates discussing the ideas is as much the mouthpiece of Plato as the Eleatic stranger or Timaeus. Before we abandon this well-grounded opinion we shall require to be convinced by cogent demonstration, which our author has made no pretence of producing.

The six chapters which form the main part of the essay contain a readable account of the principal dialogues, interspersed with critical remarks. The multitude of points raised and judgments passed renders a detailed review out of the question. The treatment of the *Sophist*, the *Gorgias* and the *Phaedrus* is perhaps the best. Generally the political dialogues are more congenial to our author than those on metaphysical sub-

jects. He is inclined to regret the *Parmenides* as an early work: upon the object with which it was written he has no light to throw except that 'Plato having resolved to go into so abstruse a subject as ontology, may have been anxious to give beforehand an idea of the difficulties surrounding it.' Nor is it quite correct to say that the subject of the second part of the dialogue is 'the number one taken in the abstract.' When we come to the *Philebus* and the *Timaeus* the narrow limits of space are very trying and the treatment is obviously inadequate. The genuineness of the epistles is defended at Plato's expense. Some of the very peculiarities of style which are objected to are, it is asserted, to be found in the *Laws* and are natural characteristics of old age. The argument on which most stress is laid is that Plato's authorship alone adequately explains the shortcomings of these compositions. If not genuine, it is assumed that they must have been written by an admirer, well acquainted with Plato's writings and anxious to defend his conduct and character. But the impression left by them is one of vanity, diffuseness, pettishness—traits of old age—joined with a measure of fairmindedness and superiority to personal spite. 'Why,' it is asked, 'if written with an apologetic object, do they exactly reproduce what a highly estimable but pettish, vainglorious and not always judicious old man would have stated under the circumstances?' Thus with no small ingenuity one of their chief arguments is turned against the objectors themselves. Another novel suggestion is that the *First Alcibiades* and the *Menexenus* are after all genuine; but the reason why they are inferior compositions is that they were written in response to pressure from without. Suppose, e.g., the criticism on Lysias to have prompted Plato's friends to demand of him, much against his will, an epideictic effort:—then the *Menexenus* would be explained.

There are other striking remarks with which we by no means concur, e.g. his exaggerated estimate of Alcibiades, the individualism of Aristippus; but enough has been said to indicate that in our opinion this is an acute piece of work which, in spite of a sometimes uncritical method, may serve as a popular introduction to the study of Plato.

R. D. HICKS.

## THE GREEK PAPYRI OF VIENNA.

*Corpus Papyrorum Raineri.* Vol. I. Griechische Texte, herausgegeben von C. WESSELY. Wien: 1895. Verlag der K.K. Hof- und Staatsdruckerei. Fl. 20.

For ten years, so the preface to this volume tells us, the preparations for the systematic publication of the great Rainer collection have been in progress. To the present writer, at least, this first product of so much labour seems rather disappointing. In the first place its contents are on the whole of decidedly second-rate importance. They are divided into two main parts, the first including the more or less complete documents, which range in date from the reign of Tiberius to that of Diocletian, and are grouped according to their subject-matter; the second, which is by far the larger, containing fragments of the same period which are related to the previous groups. This is no doubt a business-like and scientific arrangement. Except in the train of their better-preserved brethren, many of these somewhat sorry specimens could have had but a slender chance of ever displaying themselves to the world. Whether the world would have been much the poorer for the loss is another matter. The repetition of formulae, which, when duly restored, are often the only intelligible portion remaining, does not add much to our information. Anyhow, it can hardly be denied that the total result is a little dull. Even in the first part interest is with difficulty sustained. We are given two or three records of legal processes, which Dr. L. Mitteis has furnished with learned commentaries. These, with the texts on which they are based, probably form the most valuable part of the book, though it may be questioned whether a *Corpus* is quite the place for such exhaustive treatment. We have further a good series of marriage contracts, which are, however, not entirely new. The rest are sales, leases, agreements, and money transactions, of the type which the numerous recent publications both in this country and abroad have now rendered familiar, and with few special features that can attract the attention. There are doubtless better things to come; but this first course is scarcely calculated to whet the appetite.

Dr. Wessely has not seen fit to make any alteration in his methods. He eschews such refinements as the designation of

doubtful letters no less than the addition of accents and breathings and the other ordinary aids to the reader. The exclusion of the latter may possibly be more strictly scientific; none the less it is, from any but the ultra-specialist point of view, extremely inconvenient. The phraseology of these documents is frequently obscure, and difficulties are not always removed by the accompanying translations and notes. But whichever way this question of method may be ultimately decided, a speedy decision of some kind is in the highest degree desirable. The literature of this class is increasing rapidly every year, both in bulk and importance. For students of several denominations, as has before now been remarked, it is the literature of the future. If so, the sooner editors can settle their differences and adopt a single rational system, the better it will be both for their public and for themselves.

The texts are not accompanied by facsimiles, a collection of which will be published later. For the present, therefore, Dr. Wessely's large experience must be accepted as a sufficient guarantee of the accuracy of the transcripts. Experience has however failed, as even a casual reader will observe, to ensure consistency in the marking of lacunae. In a note near the end of the book (p. 298), an attempt is made to explain the plan followed; but the explanation seems very inadequate. What is the relation between dots within and dots outside brackets? Does the number of dots represent the approximate number of lost letters? Do the brackets, dots, and blank spaces, which appear to be placed indiscriminately at the beginnings of obviously mutilated lines, correspond or not to actual differences in the originals? Surely in a professedly systematic publication of this class the possibility of such questions should have been precluded.

The issue of detailed indices, like that of facsimiles, has been deferred; their absence naturally detracts very considerably from the immediate value of the work. Print and paper are alike excellent; unfortunately this advantage has not been combined with that of cheapness. In the latter important particular, as in several others, the style of the Berlin '*Griechische Urkunden*' has a distinct superiority.

H.

## SOPHOCLES AND SHAKESPEARE.

*Ars Tragica Sophoclea cum Shaksperiana Comparata.* By LIONEL HORTON-SMITH, Cambridge, Macmillan & Bowes, 1896. 6s. net.

MR. HORTON-SMITH'S Essay which has been printed 'by request' and published in a handsome form, deserves a wider audience than is commonly accorded to a Prize Exercise.

In clear and intelligible Latin he has put forth a series of observations which he has collected and arranged in a lucid order, while adding to them valuable reflections of his own. It is not his fault if the comparison of Shakespeare with Aeschylus, which might have yielded some striking results, comes only incidentally into his purview. The relation of ancient to modern tragedy is a fruitful subject which is by no means exhausted. Arising under conditions vastly different, in regions and in ages far apart, they are found to acknowledge common principles and to share a common spirit. Elizabethan tragedy shows this fact the more remarkably because it is not, like that of France and Italy, a direct imitation of the Greek. The link of connection, however, is perhaps more real externally than Mr. Horton-Smith is ready to admit. Shakespeare is closer to nature, and closer also to national feeling than his predecessors of the classical school, but he was content to borrow from them, and in following Marlowe he took over some elements which had classical prototypes. Take for example the 'Forensic Contest' which, as our author rightly says, has a subordinate place in Sophocles,—is there not more of this in Richard III. than in Shakespeare's later plays? Have we not also in that earlier style of his an alternation of *ῥῆσις* with *στιχομυθία* resembling the 'parallel verse' of a Greek play (Rich. III. i. 3. iv. 4)? But this external resemblance passes off and the essential nearness to nature and to the people remains.

There is at first sight some incongruity between the Latin text and notes, and the English headings, marginal summary and synopsis. Yet on second thoughts it appears that the author has used good judgment here. If he is to have more than a scholastic audience, as it is to be hoped he will, this inconsistency may contribute not a little to his success. The Latin dress which

he wears as a primary condition of his task, is, however, in itself an advantage. For it gives the opportunity of—

"*propriè communia dicere.*"

So much has been written both on Sophocles and Shakespeare, that many of Mr. Horton-Smith's observations if expressed in English might have appeared common-place. But those who peruse his essay, especially those to whom the subject is comparatively new, will find in it much that is striking and suggestive; and it will be unfair to him if his ample citation of authorities should be allowed to derogate from his originality. Much of what has been written on Sophocles especially is little read—still less acknowledged—and it was open to this Essayist had he so chosen to pose as the originator of many thoughts for which he has quoted parallels from previous writers. Paul Staffer, for example, an acute critic both of ancient and modern tragedy, is little known in England.

Perhaps the topics on which Mr. Horton-Smith will be found most interesting are (1) the ancient chorus, with its effects, and its equivalents in the modern drama, (2) the contrasts of character, and (3) the use of 'tragic irony.' He has done well to place this last phrase between inverted commas. For the word irony in its application to the drama has undergone a curious change of meaning. That half-dissembled consciousness of superior knowledge which the Greeks understood by the term was attributed by learned commentators either to tragic Destiny, or to the poet as the interpreter of Destiny. But when the spectator is taken into the account, as is always necessary for the right interpretation of dramatic art, the thing meant is found to be more simply the pathetic contrast between appearance and reality, which the poet emphasizes through various modes of expression. As Mr. Horton-Smith rightly observes, this motive had larger scope in ancient than in modern tragedy, because the fable was more familiar to the audience. But it appears notwithstanding: for example, to revert once more to Shakespeare's earlier style, in *Richard II.* i. sc. 1, lines 116, 117, where Richard says of Bolingbroke—

"Were he my brother, *nay my kingdom's heir,*  
As he is but my father's brother's son,"  
&c. ;

Or again, in a deeper manner, in Duncan's remark on Cawdor's treason, and where Hamlet says, in lines unfortunately corrupted, and too often 'cut' in the performance from the earliest times—

"So, oft it chances in particular men,  
That for some vicious mole of nature in  
them," &c.

*Hamlet*, i sc. 4, ll. 23-38.

It is rather surprising that in speaking of anachronisms Mr. Horton-Smith should not have referred to Hector's quotation from Aristotle, and I think that something more might have been made of the essential

analogy in point of dramatic construction between plays so widely disparate as the Oedipus Tyrannus and Macbeth; also the subtle changes of mood in the protagonists in Sophocles' dramas might have been profitably compared with the psychological evolution of great parts in Shakespeare. But this writer has broken ground effectively, as I have said, in a fruitful subject; and in treating of a theme which is very apt to lend itself to fantastic subtleties or to the pedantries of 'science falsely so called,' he has not overstepped the bounds of common-sense.

LEWIS CAMPBELL.

#### HARTMAN'S EPISTOLA CRITICA.

*Epistola Critica ad amicos J. van Leeuwen et M. B. da Costa continens annotationes ad Odysseam.* Scripsit J. J. HARTMAN. 8vo. 136, vi. pp. Lugd. Bat. A. W. Sijthoff, 1896. 3 M. 50.

THE above work is addressed by Prof. Hartman to the two well-known Leyden editors of Homer on the occasion of the appearance of the second and concluding volume of their edition of the *Iliad* (Ed. 2). It is presented as a congratulatory tribute on the conclusion of their task in accordance with a graceful custom in vogue among continental scholars, a custom either entirely unknown in England or, if recognised at all, certainly seldom honoured by observance. The scope of the book is indicated by the title. It is a series of notes and observations on the Odyssey, put together, we are informed, by the author while reading the commentary thereon previously published by his two friends. He begins by recognising in the most generous terms the merit and value of their achievement, and submits his own lucubrations to their consideration with many professions of modest deference. He hopes to find in them judges at once competent and friendly. He declares that he has in the main discussed passages, which they themselves have left without annotation. Sometimes he has supported conclusions they have reached, and occasionally he has dissented from their expressed opinions. The character and quality of his book may now occupy our attention. First of all I will refer with all possible brevity to a few of the

emendations he suggests, which seem interesting and valuable:—

γ 27 οὐ γὰρ δῶ | οὐ σε θεῶν δέκητι. To avoid the unique double negative he proposes ἦ γὰρ δῶ, comparing A 78 ἦ γὰρ δόμοι.

δ 639 οὐ γὰρ ἔφαντο | ἐς Πύλον οἴχασθαι. Here H.'s οὐδέ F' ἔφαντο is evidently a better suggestion than L. and C.'s cacophonous οὐ γὰρ ἔφαν τόν.

ζ 245 ἐνθάδε ναϊεράων καί οἱ ἄδοι αὐτόθι μύμνεν. There is ingenuity and sense in the proposed ἐνθάδε ναϊεράων ἢ ᾧ ἄδοι αὐτόθι μύμνεν, 'either a dweller here or one who would be content here to abide,' i.e. a countryman or an alien. He aptly compares ψ 136, and would not object to retain οἱ, but considers it unnecessary that Odysseus should be definitely referred to. But after all in the earliest writing there would be little difference between οἱ and ᾧ.

ι 330 ἦ ῥα κατὰ σπέεος κέχυτο μεγάλη ἤλιθα πολλή. L. and C. propose μυχόν for the unsatisfactory μεγάλη. H. suggests διὰ σπέεος μήλων κέχυτ', supporting the introduction of μήλων by ρ 297,

ἦ οἱ προπάρειθε θυράων  
ἡμιόνων τε βοῶν τε ἅλιν κέχυτ'.

κ 303 καί μοι φύσιν αὐτοῦ ἔδειξε. For αὐτοῦ he suggests αὐτός ad comitatem benigni dei significandam, an improvement certainly, but φύσιν is open to no less serious objection than αὐτοῦ itself, neither is ἐκ γαίης ἐρύσας at the beginning of the line easily to be reconciled with the preceding τῇ, τότε φάρμακον ἐσθλὸν ἔχων (287). The whole line is almost



certainly an interpolation and may be removed without loss.

μ 71 καὶ νύ κε καὶ τὴν κῆμα βάλε is a bold alteration of καὶ νύ κε τὴν ἐνθ' ὧκα βάλε to supply a subject to βάλε. He compares L. and C.'s emendation of χ 456, ταὶ δὲ ῥύν' ἐκφόρεον, τίθεσαν δὲ θύραζε, where a missing object, as here a subject, is neatly supplied.

π 181 ἀλλοῖός μοι, ξείν', ἐφάνης νέον ἢ ἐπαύριον. That this, the traditional and current reading, is unsound seems hardly doubtful. Still the solution proposed by our author, νέον ἢ δὲ παύριον, modo et antea, is not very attractive; indeed νέον could very well dispense with the addition ἢ δὲ παύριον altogether. Perhaps ἢ ἐπερ ἐσσί or ἢ ἐπερ ἦδη is nearer the mark.

π 349 ἐς δ' ἐρέτας ἀλῆγας ἀγέρομαι. For ἀλῆγας he would write ἐπιτηδές from A 142. He accounts for the intrusion of ἀλῆγας very ingeniously as a necessary metrical expansion of αἰας, a gloss on ἐπιτηδές.

ρ 515 τρεῖς γὰρ δὴ μιν νίκτας ἔχον, τρία δ' ἡματ' ἔρυσσεν. Here there is a fair, even a strong probability that his ἐγώ is right and ἔχον a mere corruption of the text. The superiority of ἐγώ is undeniable.

ν 106 ἐνθ' ἄρα οἱ μύλαι ἦτο ποιμένι λαῶν. Here he objects to the utter inappropriateness of ἦτο (εἶτο), proposing ἦσαν, which may indeed, for an obvious reason (v. *Class. Rev.* Febr. 1897), have been changed. The addition of ζέξ, or as he prefers to write it *φέξ*, is certainly ingenious and probably correct. He would read ἐνθ' ἄρα *φέξ* μύλαι ἦσαν ποιμένι λαῶν. Perhaps *φ' ζέξ* (*Φοι ζέξ*) would be preferable. A good deal might be said in favour of maintaining the pronoun here. The digamma in ζέξ is by no means beyond question.

φ 305. For αἶ κε τὸ τόξον he proposes the simple and convincing αἶ κε σὺν τόξον.

χ 184 σάκος εἰρὸν γέρον. He suspects, not unreasonably, the genuineness of γέρον and proposes to substitute φέρον, a change worth consideration.

ψ 52 ἀλλ' ἔπε', ὄφρα σφῶν εὐφροσύνης ἐπιβήη  
ἀμφοτέρων φίλον ἦτορ.

Here instead of Bekker's ἐπιβήη, which L. and C. have adopted, he proposes to read ἐπιβήσω, 'ut utriusque vestrum mentem ad laetitiam adducam.' The MSS. have ἐπιβήγον, an intolerable form for ἐπιβήγον, which however generally maintains its ground in the texts accompanied by Nauck's correction, σφῶν. I cannot but think that Hartman's suggestion is in every way preferable to

NO. XCIV. VOL. XI.

anything yet offered. ἐπιβήγον is clearly due to the ancient critics, who believed that σφῶν was the nominative, cf. H. 99 (*Class. Rev.* Oct. 1896).

ω 348 τὸν δὲ ποτὶ οἱ | εἶλεν. He disposes satisfactorily of L. and C.'s defence of εἶλεν and restores εἶλεν from A 239 εἶλεν' ἐπὶ οἱ μεμαῶς.

Let us now turn our survey from the positive to the negative, from the constructive to the destructive criticism, wherewith he condemns emendations which have been made without sufficient warrant by other scholars. Here also we find matter of interest. In β 77 I am glad to see that he prefers the vulgate, ἀπαιτίζοντες, ὥς, bad as it is, to L. and C.'s ἀπαιτίζονθ', ἦος, because he objects to Telemachus contemplating a prospective pilgrimage *in company with his mother* asking for restitution, a picture truly ultra-Euripidean in its pathos.

ζ 257. Here Herwerden's ἐτι δήμεν is censured, though its ingenuity is justly praised; for, he urges, it is immaterial to Odysseus whether he finds the guests still present or not. If anything, he would probably prefer that they should be gone. He is sure to see them there later on, and it would be time enough to make their acquaintance then (εἰδίσσεται, cognitos habebit).

θ 208. L. and C. have managed to eliminate ἄν from this line by reading:—

ξείνος γάρ μοι ὄδε· τίς κεν φιλεῖντι μάχοιτο;

which is supposed to scan. Hartman considers the passage a bundle of incongruities, and so regards verbal alteration as wasted labour. However, as this is a view presumably not held by L. and C., there can be no harm in suggesting a more metrical line:—

ξείνος γάρ μοι ὄδ' ἐστί· τίς ἄρ κε φιλεῖντι μάχοιτο;

μ 27. He defends the vulgate ἢ ἀλὸς ἢ ἐπὶ γῆς against Fick's ἢ γαίης.

ξ 122. ὦ γέρον, οὗ τις κείνον ἀνὴρ ἀλαλημένος ἐλθὼν  
ἀγγέλλον πείσειε γυναῖκά τε καὶ φίλον υἱόν.

He rejects L. and C.'s εἰ τις for οὗ τις, which would convert the sentence into a wish, and proposes himself οὗ κεν κείνον. Perhaps οὗ τις κεν τὸν ἀνὴρ would account more easily for the vulgate.

K

ξ 287. L. and C.'s ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ μοι ἐπιπλόμενον ἔτος ὄγδοον ἦλθε is certainly not a desirable transposition. Ordo vix Homericus videtur, says Hartman.

ξ 495. This line, assailed by Aristarchus, Cobet and others, he defends vigorously. He denies that λίην γάρ (496) can properly begin a speech without a vocative preceding as at κ 190. Similarly he demurs at 381-2 to beginning a speech with ἀλλ' ἄγε, as Friedländer's removal of 381-2 would necessitate.

π 423. He condemns L. and C.'s ἀλλοδαποῖσι for ἀλλήλοισι, and most readers will agree with him.

On the other hand he freely bestows approval on conjectures which he considers meritorious, as Cobet's ζῆμυε δ 733, Nauck's εἰ ποτέ σοι κ 66, Naber's ἔφυσαν κ 393 with removal of 394, Herwerden's ἐνῆκε ο 198 for ἐνήσει.

ω 198. He accepts with both hands, ambabus manibus, ἐχέφρονα Πηνελόπειαν from Bothe and Bekker, and rightly scouts the idea of the gods composing a poem for mankind as a reward to Penelope for good conduct, as the vulgate would have us believe.

Perhaps it is in the rejection of supposed interpolations or corruptions that most difficulty will be felt in accepting Prof. Hartman's views; yet even when he fails to convince, as is often the case, the line of argument he pursues is generally deserving of careful consideration.

He condemns δ 739-41, λ 274-5, ο 299-300, 373, ρ 533, passages where it is difficult to refuse assent to his criticism. He is less successful, I think, in attacking α 205, δ 684, where the knot should be untied, not cut.

ο 227 ἀφνειὸς Πυλίοισι μέγ' ἔξοχα δώματα ναίων.

He is mistaken in supposing μέγ' ἔξοχα open to objection (ineptum). Not only is the use of μέγα with adjectives, positive, comparative, and superlative, quite Homeric, but this identical combination is to be found B 480, φ 266, surely a sufficient warrant. Again to adopt μετ', a variant of μέγ', because it spoils the line, is really too cruel by half. Why not read by a slight change ἀφνει' ἐν Πυλίοισι? The application of ἀφνειός to a house may be found α 232, 393, ρ 420. Still it is so much more frequently applied to a person, that the appearance of the nom.

here, though entailing the loss of ἐν, is not surprising.

ν 42 ἀμύμονα δ' οἶκοι ἄκουιν—εὔροιμι. He suspects ἀμύμονα, desiderating ἀπήμονα or the like. But the epithet is not necessarily a part of the predication, which is complete without it.

τ 45. He naturally asks what is the force of ἐρεθίζω here. That Odysseus should wish to 'provoke' his wife and servants is little less than an absurdity. Perhaps the true reading was ἀλεγίνω, or nearer to the tradition ἀλεγίζω. The latter may have been altered from the idea that the genitive should follow, as is usual.

Reasonable exception is also taken to the following: τ 68 δαιτὸς ὄνησο, ν 304 θυμῷ, φ 260 ἅπαντας, 291 καὶ ῥήσιος. χ 380 is rejected as spurious, because the safety of the individuals is already assured. In χ 499 καὶ κύνειον ἀγαπαζόμενοι. L. and C. read καὶ κύνειον ἢ ἀγαπαζόμενοι. Hartman objects to the pronoun coming in at all. The real objection is to its position. We might read καὶ ἦ κύνειον which can be scanned with a synizesis of -ειον.

ψ 175 οὔτε λίην ἀγαμαί is deservedly mis-doubted. Quomodo et quo sensu annectatur praecedentibus pervelim me doceatis, he says, and will probably appeal in vain. Meanwhile ἀλλά may be suggested for οὔτε as a slight improvement, 'But I marvel much,' 'greatly do I wonder,' cf. ζ 168.

Many of the objections however seem scarcely tenable. In μ 52 τερόμενος may fairly be defended in spite of the discomfort suffered from the bonds. It is scarcely credible that any interpolator meant it to be equivalent to χαίρων 'with impunity.' It is far simpler and indeed quite satisfactory to understand that Odysseus snatches a joy even at the cost of some corporal pain. In π 244 it is surely hypercritical to object to the suitors being called ἰφθίμοι, to say nothing of the fact that the epithet is applied more than half a dozen times to women, Penelope, &c. ν 14 and χ 7 are also instances in which one can hardly subscribe to the opinions expressed. Still upon the whole we have here a body of criticism by no means unworthy of the famous Leyden University, and as productions of this kind and quality are rare in England, I need make no apology for calling attention even at some length to Professor Hartman's meritorious work.

T. L. AGAR.

## ARCHAEOLOGY.

HITZIG AND BLUEMNER'S EDITION  
OF PAUSANIAS.

*Pausaniae Graeciae Descriptio*, edidit, Graeca emendavit, apparatus criticum adjecit Hermannus Hitzig, commentarium Germanice scriptum cum tabulis topographicis et numismaticis addiderunt HERMANNUS HITZIG et HUGO BLUEMNER. Voluminis prioris pars prior. Liber primus; Attica. Berolini, 1896, apud S. Calvary & Co. 18 Mk.

A NEW critical and exegetical edition of Pausanias has long been among the chief desiderata in an archaeological library. Though the *Ἑλλάδος περιήγησις*—a title, by the way, which is conspicuously absent from the new edition—is perhaps more often quoted and referred to by archaeologists than any other classical work, there has been no annotated edition since that of Siebelis, in 1822–28; while the critical edition of Schubart and Walz (1838–9) hardly fulfills modern requirements. More than one attempt is being made to meet the need; the first to appear is the edition now before us, which, however, at present contains only the first book, the more important parts of which are also included in Mrs. Verrall and Miss Harrison's *Mythology and Monuments of Ancient Athens*.

The *apparatus criticus* is about twice as extensive as that in Schubart and Walz. The additional matter is partly due to a new collation of the more important MSS., especially those in Paris, which had only been consulted occasionally or at second hand by the earlier editors; partly to the mass of conjectural emendations that have been made since 1838. The text, however, is but little altered; hardly any conjectures have been admitted into it, though so many are recorded, and though the editor acknowledges the state of the tradition to be such that there is ample scope both for choice between recorded readings and for guesses at their original. The additions to the *apparatus* are mainly valuable for the help they give in estimating the value of the various MSS. and their relation to one another: in many difficult places one would have been glad to have had a more definite statement of opinion from an editor who has made so careful a study of his author's peculiarities; for, in the case of Pausanias, it is peculiarly

necessary to have a minute acquaintance with the author's language and mannerisms in order to choose between different readings and conjectures.

In the commentary also the tendency is on the whole conservative, as is fitting in a work dedicated to Ernst Curtius. Yet the newest theories appear to be all stated with clearness and impartiality, even when the editors do not adopt them, or express their dissent from them. Indeed, the fulness with which all suggestions are enumerated perhaps amounts to a fault; any suggestion by an authority like Dörpfeld or Lolling is worth recording, because it is based on thorough knowledge of the sites, and may be suggestive even if afterwards withdrawn by its author; but there are many guesses by less competent writers of which it is difficult to see the use. In most cases of difficulty—and they abound in this book—the editors content themselves with an enumeration of the various views that have been proposed; and such an enumeration is most bewildering without a summary and expression of opinion to conclude it, especially when authorities of very different weight are quoted side by side. Judging by this commentary alone, one would again and again be disposed to despair of any conclusion, with a 'who shall decide when doctors disagree?' Only occasionally the editors venture on a decided opinion; thus they express their scepticism as to the placing of the Enneacrunus south-west of the Areopagus, an opinion of which Dörpfeld is now the chief advocate. Yet in dealing with the whole Enneacrunus episode, of which this is the crucial point, they content themselves with mentioning the various theories that have been held. In so complicated a matter, an editor is justified in reserving his judgment; but one may expect from him at least a judicial summing up, if not a definite verdict. Here we are left to unravel the evidence and the speeches of the various counsel for ourselves. We should have been very glad to hear how an editor familiar with the idiosyncrasies of Pausanias would explain this curious deviation from the natural order of description. Again, of the plans at the end of the book, no less than five are restorations of the Agora, to show the route of Pausanias; these restorations, being by different authorities, differ very widely from one another,

yet there is no special comment on them and no criticism; nor do the editors venture on any restoration or route of their own. The result is more confusing than if there were no plans at all. It may be said that it is not the duty of an editor of Pausanias to write a treatise on the topography of Athens; but unless he has a clear notion of the topography in his mind, his notes can hardly fail to be confusing; and that is just what has happened in the present instance.

It follows from what has already been said that there is but little scope for criticism of details. The compilation is evidently so careful and thorough as not to leave any serious gaps. The text, as we have seen, has little that is new; but a few changes are worth noticing. In 19, 1 Dindorf's emendation *παρήγε τὸν ὄροφον* is certainly right, in view of *Pollux*, x. 170, showing that *ὄροφος* means rush thatching; but why is the order changed to *τὸν ὄροφον·παρήγε*? All the MSS. have *παρῆν τὸν ὄροφον*. In 29, 2 the 'Epics of Sappho' rightly disappear; there can be no doubt, on referring to viii. 35, 8, that Pausanias wrote *Πάμφω*. But in 29, 7 the repetition of *ἐτάφησαν* and the full stop are quite needless '*τῶν ἐπ' Ὀλυνθον ἐλθόντων οἱ δοκιμώτατοι . . . , ἐτάφησαν δὲ καὶ οἱ τελεύσαντες πολεμοῦντες Κασσάνδρου κ.τ.λ.*' is a perfectly clear construction. Another passage, which has long been a difficulty, has met at last with a successful remedy by the insertion of *ὁδον*—*τὴν δὲ ὀνομαζομένην ἀπὸ Σκίρωνος καὶ ἐς τὴν ὁδὸν Σκίρων, ἥντινα Μεγαρεῖσιν ἐπολεμάρχει, . . . ἐποίησεν*. The MSS. give the form *Σκιρώνην*, of which the origin is obvious; and many previous editors have been misled by it, or have suspected a lacuna or a serious error.

To pass to the commentary, it surely shows a curious ignorance of modern research to pass over *Λύκος* and *Λυκτεῖον* with the explanation that *Lykos* means light-bringer, and that the Greek connexion with *Λύκος*, wolf, is a mere error; it seems strange perversity in a case like this, when *Aegeus* appears in the next sentence, and is simply dismissed as 'darkness or winter.' Indeed, mythological matters are very generally neglected or treated from an antiquated standpoint. Even so interesting a question as the *Buphonia* 28, 11, receives no discussion whatever. The subject of the Panathenaic ship is always a most confusing one, and little is here found to remedy the confusion, which arises in great part from an application to the festival in earlier times of a particular and probably novel invention

of *Herodes Atticus*, described by *Philostratus* (*Vit. Soph.* ii. 1, 5). He made an elaborate structure resembling a ship, and drawn by hidden machinery, to take the place of the earlier car, on which was erected the pole carrying the *peplos* which suggested the comparison of a sail. This machine of *Herodes* may not have been set up in Athens until after *Pausanias*' visit; he inserts it at the very end of his description of the sights in the city of Athens; and it may well have been left at first near the *Areopagus*, and later transferred to the place near the *Pythion* where *Philostratus* saw it, and where it would be near to the monument of *Herodes*; it was probably taken round the city with the procession every four years. If *Pausanias* and *Philostratus* are both right, the only alternative is to suppose that the *Pythion* here means the cave of *Apollo*, which is usually known as the sanctuary of *Apollo ὑπακράϊος*. This expedient is adopted by the editors, though they reject elsewhere *Dörpfeld*'s theory that *Thucydides* refers to this *Pythion* in the famous passage ii. 15. The editors have no hesitation in saying that *Thucydides* must refer here to the great *Pythion* near the *Ilissus*—or *Ilissus* as it is now written—and there is no other satisfactory evidence for a confusion.

The fulness of this edition in reference to all that has been published, especially in Germany, will make it a most valuable acquisition to all students of the topography of Athens; and if we do not always find in it much help towards the solution of our difficulties, we at least find an abundant record of the way in which they have hitherto been dealt with. It is but a tribute to the competence of the editors, to say that we should like to know their own opinion as to many questions on which they only tell us the theories of their predecessors.

ERNEST GARDNER.

#### BORNECQUE'S EDITION OF CICERO DE SIGNIS.

*M. Tullii Ciceronis Oratio in Verrem de Signis, publiée avec une Introduction et un Commentaire explicatif.* Par HENRI BORNECQUE. Paris, 1896. Price 1f. 50c.

THIS is a charming little edition, printed in good type on good paper, with convenient



footnotes on points of grammar or history and an excellent introduction, all for the modest sum of 1s. 3d. A scholarly analysis of the speech and discussion of its circumstances and political significance are followed by some excellent sections on Roman criticism and appreciation, on the works of art mentioned in the speech, on Verres as connoisseur and collector, and on Cicero as art-critic. That in an introduction of 44 pages to a school-book, 30 should be devoted to the discussion of artistic matter, shews how surely in France, as in Germany, archaeology is gaining ground as a school subject.

It may be questioned, however, whether in writing for young students M. Bornecque is wise in bringing forward certain recent, entirely unproved identifications of ancient statues. It seems out of place in a book of this kind to state, even on the high authority of Furtwängler, that so unattractive an object as a certain, now headless, herm once had a head displaying the features of the Myronian Apollo, or to mention the Albani bust as the copy of the Sappho of Seilanian. Although the latter identification receives apparently M. Collignon's full approval (*Hist. de la Sculpt. Grecque*, ii. p. 345) it rests on a misunderstanding of the evolution of the type represented by the bust (see Furtwängler, *Masterpieces of Gr. Sc.* p. 66 ff. where the head is more correctly interpreted as an Aphrodite). On the other hand it is surprising that M. Bornecque in discussing the *simulacrum Aristaei* of § 128, omits to connect the type of Aristaios with the beautiful bronze statuette in the Bibliothèque Nationale (Babelon et Blanchet, *Cat. des Bronzes Antiques, de la Bibl. Nat.* p. 264, No. 623; Furtwängler, *Meisterwerke d. Gr. Pl.* p. 490, Pl. XXXVIII. = Engl. ed. p. 276, Fig. 116; cf. E. Michon in *Monuments et Mémoires*, fond. Piot. vol. iii. p. 64).

The foot-notes are fully adequate to the purpose of the book: we get more grammar than in the small school edition of Thomas (Paris, 1886), and besides much that is due to his own research the author gives us the best out of Thomas' larger edition. In two or three small points, however, the earlier editor is followed to disadvantage. The statement on p. 49, note 1, that in the phrase... *Thespiades quae ad aedem Felicitatis sunt* of § 4, *ad* is equivalent to *in* ('dans') re-opens a vexed question. These 'Thespiades,' which are usually assigned to Praxiteles, are mentioned in identical phrase by Pliny *N.H.* xxxvi., 39 (*Thespiades ad aedem Felicitatis*). The Praxitelean statues

mentioned in xxxiv., 69 as being *ante aedem Felicitatis* throw no further light on the subject; for these works were of bronze while the Thespiades were of marble; attempts at identification are futile since the Romans, precisely like the moderns, constantly brought together into one place several works by the same artist. At the same time it would appear that *ad* in the Plinian passage first quoted is practically equivalent to *ante*; Pliny seems careful to use *in* when he means *inside*, *ante* when he means exactly in front, while *ad* he uses more loosely when he merely means outside the temple, i.e. within its precinct in some adjacent space or portico (cf. *ad aedem Fortunae Huiusce Diei* in *N.H.* xxxiv., 54). Of the four Ciceronian instances, quoted by Thomas, by Bornecque and by Bornecque's chief grammatical authority Riemann, three need mean no more than is implied by our English 'at'; the place where without necessary implication of 'inside'; they occur with the word *villa* (*Verr.* iv. § 36; *pro Rosc. Amer.* § 44; *pro M. Tullio*, § 20); the fourth instance *utinam ad Opis maneret!* (*Phil.* i., 7) comes nearer to requiring the absolute sense of *in*. Still another ambiguous example is the *ad aedem Honoris et Virtutis* of *Verr.* iv. § 121. The point has already been touched upon by Mr. J. S. Reid in his notice (*Class. Rev.* ii., 1888, p. 210b) of Thomas' larger edition of the same speech; it would be a real boon to students of archaeology, if some philologist would definitely clear it up.<sup>1</sup> On p. 53 n. 11 it is repeated from Thomas that the word *ereptio* in § 10 is in all Latin only to be found in this passage. What about the *in animae ereptione* of Tertullian?—a phrase, by the way which Lewis and Short erroneously quote as from the *de Spectaculis*; it occurs in the *de Idolatria* 2.—One might perhaps expect a note on the *ingere e ceru* of § 36. Still all these are trivial points in a school edition which should be welcomed as a delightful guide to a Ciceronian speech which owing to its humour, to its gaiety, to the concreteness of the matter touched upon is exceedingly attractive to young students.

EUGÉNIE SELLERS.

MUNICH.

<sup>1</sup> An attempt to answer this question is made on page 111 of this number.—G. E. M.

SCHNEIDER'S *DAS ALTE ROM.*

*Das Alte Rom.* Entwicklung seines Grundrisses u. Geschichte seiner Bauten auf 12 Karten u. 14 Tafeln dargestellt mit e. Plane d. heutigen Stadt sowie e. stadtgeschichtlichen Einleitung, herausgegeben von ARTHUR SCHNEIDER. Folio, Pp. xii., 14 Plates with over 2600 Illustrations, 12 Maps on tracing paper and 1 Map on card. Leipzig: Teubner, 1896. 16 Mk.

THIS is a work which only needs to be used to become indispensable to all who have an interest in the topography of Rome. It is an adequate pictorial summary of nearly all that is known of the ancient city, compressed into the smallest possible limits.

The most original feature in the book is a series of maps on tracing paper. By inserting the accompanying plan of modern Rome beneath one of these the ruins of any of twelve selected periods are shown distinctly in their correct position. Besides this the paper is transparent enough to allow two or three maps to be taken together, thus showing the change from one period to another. The periods chosen start with the Roma Quadrata of prehistoric times and end with the third and fourth centuries A.D.

The plates also deserve much praise. They are large enough to allow an average of over 20 illustrations to the page and not only give photographs of the existing remains, with detailed ground plans, but add illustrations from sculptures, coins, old sketch books and reconstructions by good authorities. The resources of a large library and a fine collection of photographs are thus placed at the service of all who can afford the modest sum of sixteen shillings. As a rule the reproductions of the photographs, the weak point in most books of the kind, are distinctly good and the plans and restorations are on a sufficiently large scale to be clear, a rare merit. A happy idea of the editor's has been to insert near some of the ancient plans sections from modern maps of Berlin, Vienna, Leipzig or Munich of the same size, to give those familiar with these towns a conception of the comparative size of public places at Rome. Trafalgar Square and its surroundings compared with the Forum, Olympia with the Coliseum would be English equivalents.

The only criticism that suggests itself is that in some of the plates illustrations which have but little to do with Rome are introduced. This is especially the case with the

Etruscan and Alban antiquities of the earlier plates, and the Pompeian houses of the latter. These additions however serve the purpose of putting the Roman remains in a better historical perspective and as such justify their presence from a practical teacher's point of view.

As an aid to teaching, the Atlas suffers from its size of page. It would be difficult to show most of the illustrations to more than one student at a time and it is too large to be handed round.

Its value would be much increased by an index, for it requires a certain familiarity with the dates and correct names of the buildings to discover them easily.

Doctor Schneider's introduction is a general sketch of the changes in the outward appearance of Rome. He gives no detailed description of the illustrations, but leaves readers to consult standard works, with titles and references to the source of the illustration to guide them.

His intention is to provide material for first hand study, to supplement and not to supplant the works of Lanciani, Hulsen and others. With his aid Murray and Baedeker can be read with interest at home and perhaps even used for class teaching.

Finally, we have nothing but praise for the ingenuity and industry shown in the accumulation and selection of illustrations and trust that the work will be soon on the table of every school and college library.

W. C. F. ANDERSON.

## MARRIOTT ON THE MASONS' MARKS IN POMPEI.

*Facts about Pompeii; Its Masons' Marks, Town Walls, Houses and Portraits;* with a complete list of the Masons' Marks cut in the stones, by H. P. FITZ-GERALD MARRIOTT, 4to. Pp. 89, with 11 Plates, 1 Plan and 6 illustrations. London: Hazell, Watson and Viney. No date (1895?).

IN this sumptuously printed work we have a curious medley of descriptions, impressions and original observations. The author is not a professed archaeologist but he has diligently collected the Masons' Marks throughout the town. They fill twelve pages (pp. 63 to 85 with alternate blank leaves) of his monograph, and are accompanied by notes of the locality. Mr. Fitzgerald

Marriott has, perhaps wisely, abstained from either criticising, classifying or giving references to them, so that they remain as raw materials for future work. A detailed list of the towers in the walls is also given with a sketch showing the structure of one of them, but not much new information. The rest of the work is occupied with an abstract of Mau's work on the 'Four styles of Mural Decoration,' and notes on lately discovered houses. This part is intended to supplement the old guide-books and is of interest in many ways. The account of the 'cliff-houses' will be useful to those who have not had the opportunity of visiting them. The remainder of the monograph is of no special value except to the tourist. The plates are photo-lithographic and for the most part have been printed so heavily that all gradations in tone are blocked up. Five of them are originals, the rest reproductions of well-known photographs, including the Hermes from Herculaneum.

The book has, we suspect, been published by subscription and probably its defects are due to the desire to please a mixed circle of friends. It seems a pity that the author's advisers were not more discreet. He has done good work in the matter of direct, original observation but as yet does not appear to have reached results sufficient to justify such an ambitious publication. One may expect better work from him in the future.

W. C. F. ANDERSON.

#### GASTON BOISSIER'S *L'AFRIQUE ROMAINE*.

GASTON BOISSIER. *L'Afrique Romaine; Promenades archéologiques en Algérie et en Tunisie*. 12mo. Pp. 325, with 4 Plans. Paris: Hachette, 1895. 3 fr. 50 c.

THE interest in M. Boissier's latest work is somewhat different from that in his familiar musings on classic sites in Italy. His theme is not so hackneyed, and the monuments and ruins he saw are scarcely known to the world at large. Yet he has no Horace and Virgil to read by the way and inspire his meditations. He even dismisses the thought of giving more than a hint of the manner in which Virgil composed the fourth Aeneid. He prefers to seek inspiration from patriotic visions of the future, and throughout seeks parallels in the history of French

conquest for the incidents of the Roman campaigns. The triumph of Rome and the prosperity of the Province under the Emperors are to him but a forecast of what may be achieved by enlightened French Government.

The book begins with an examination of the various races that inhabit Algeria and Tunis. The author holds that the Berber race, which he takes to include both the dark and fair types, is truly indigenous, descended from the aborigines of pre-historic times. Though conquered and civilised by Carthaginian, Roman, Byzantine and Arab they have retained their language and now remain much as they were when the Roman first entered the country. This is the keynote of the work, which ends as it begins with a reference to the mission of France to bring the Berbers back once more to civilisation. A sketch of the successive conquests of North Africa is given, followed by an account of the Roman methods of administration and of the remains of Roman villas and towns. An interesting description of the excavations at Timgad serves as an object lesson to show the far reaching results of Roman rule. This is further illustrated by a study and appreciation of Apuleius and Dracontius. Then the book closes with an investigation of the reason why the Roman spirit was never thoroughly assimilated; the explanation being the continuity of the Berber nationality, which remained and still remains unchanged.

To those who have learned to know M. Boissier from his earlier works there is no need to recommend his last. They will find in it that his style has lost nothing of its simple elegance, and that his many sided genial scholarship can make even the dry details of archaeological and anthropological research interesting.

W. C. F. ANDERSON.

#### TRANSLATION OF GASTON BOISSIER'S *NOUVELLES PROMENADES*.

*The Country of Horace and Virgil*. By GASTON BOISSIER, Translated by D. HAVELLOCK FISHER. Pp. xi. + 346, with Maps and Plans. 8vo. London: Fisher Unwin, 1896. 7s. 6d.

THE *Nouvelles promenades archéologiques, Horace et Virgile*, has reached a third edition. It is a *causerie*, a delightful series of reflections and impressions recorded after

a visit to Rome. M. Boissier visits the site of Horace's farm, Horace in hand, and meditates on Maecenas and his circle, life in Rome and the character of the poet. He explores the tombs at Corneto, moralises on malaria and its effects and attempts to give an estimate of the Etruscan view of life as shown by the wall-paintings and furniture of the sepulchral chambers. An excursion to Trapani, Eryx, and Segesta suggests a discussion of the fifth book of the Aeneid, the worship of Venus, Theocritus, Bucolic poetry &c. A walk from Ostia to Pratica (*Lavinium*) and a ramble in search of Laurentum naturally lead to an appreciation of the last six books of the Aeneid. Surely nothing can be worse chosen than the English title. It emphasises the least important part of the book, the topographical; and is inadequate, for at least three fourths of the matter have nothing to do with the country.

The title page is misleading in another respect. It says 'with maps and plans' but there are only two maps and no plans. As for the translation the best that can be said is that it is readable but shockingly inaccurate. Either the translator knows no Latin, and no Greek, or else he never corrects proofs and allows full play to the conjectural emendations of the British printer. The misprints are so frequent and appalling that we should recommend the publisher to issue a list of errata with all copies, or else, for his own credit, to recall the edition.

The following examples will suffice; Plancus becomes Plaucus (pp. 21, 23), or Planeus (p. 56), Marcellus masquerades as Marullus (p. 51, twice); we have Thassus (= Thapsus (p. 210), Maegara (= Megara p. 210), Lucian (= Lucan, p. 166), Gaulon and Squalan (= Caulon and Scylaceum p. 202), Juno Sacinia (= Lacinia p. 202), Pythagorus (p. 202), Xanthe (= Xanthus, p. 90), Albanian (= Albunean, p. 333), Pachinum (= Pachynum, p. 212), Marsci (= Marsi p. 244), Lucretalis (= Lucretilis, p. 4), Cumea (= Cumae, p. 146). Besides these we find a large number of bastard forms, such as Aulu-Gelle, Denys of Halicarnassus, Pollion, Eolo-Dorian, Segestes, Selinonte, Pessinonte, Valerino Maximus. Even modern names are incorrect; 'Vulei' for Vulci occurs three times (pp. 70, 90, 105), Coere for Caere also three times (pp. 91, 109, 111), we have too 'Scalager' (p. 209), Pentinger (= Peutingen, p. 4). Sometimes there are misprints in the English, e.g. 'orational' (= national, p. 151), 'mused' (= nursed, p. 175), everywhere there is a mixture of

modern Italian place-names with classical, e.g. Baia, Grecia Magna, occasionally there are downright mistakes, as 514 B.C. (p. 144) for A.U.C. and there are numerous misprints in the Latin quotations. Taken altogether it would be difficult to find a more unscholarly or 'corrupt' text. We are heartily sorry for M. Boissier.

W. C. F. ANDERSON.

#### TORR'S MYCENAE AND MEMPHIS.

In the vain hope of avoiding controversy of this kind, I gave Mr. Torr the opportunity of seeing my review of his book in proof. After receiving a lengthy rejoinder, and working over the whole ground again, I altered or omitted everything of which I felt that he had reasonable ground to complain. But Mr. Torr has since commented upon other passages also in my review; and by sentences selected from the review itself and from articles cited therein has attempted to make me say a number of very foolish things. Most of them I did not in effect say: the remainder I am prepared to stand by until he has refuted them.

I have however to apologise for two wrong references which Mr. Torr has corrected; and for two other misprints which he has set down to me as archaeological blunders.

His method of refutation may be estimated from a few examples in which my reply can be brief.

On the Telle-Amarna question, he repeats his former representation of the evidence, omitting, as before, the vital fact that the Aegean potsherds were found, *not* separately, but throughout a very large mass of XVIIIth Dynasty potsherds, in such a way that subsequent admixture is out of the question. This fact disposes of both the questions which he propounds. The Aegean pottery is of XVIIIth Dynasty date, because it cannot have been put where it was found at any subsequent date.

On the Kahun question, Mr. Torr quotes only half of Prof. Petrie's statement, and then accuses me of misrepresenting him. The passage to which I referred is quoted in Mr. Torr's own review of Prof. Petrie's book. Prof. Petrie's 'internal evidence contradicting a late date' is as follows, in the passage to which I referred:—

'None were finer or thinner than [the fragments published *Mahun*, Pl. i. 12, 14; *J. H. S.* xi. Pl. xiv.



5]. Now these belong to a class of vessel which is wholly unknown to myself or to other students to whom I have referred, as ever having been found in historic pottery. The mouth is a simple hole without a lip, like a hole cut in a gourd.'

This is the form which Mr. Torr cannot distinguish from the Greek *stamnos* which has a distinct neck.

Throughout these paragraphs Mr. Torr has confused my summary of Prof. Petrie's argument with my own independent observations. I only quoted Prof. Petrie's authority for statements which he has made.

On the Cretan origin of the pottery in question, Mr. Torr ingeniously rearranges his quotation. The sentences, from 'The general character . . . ' onwards, begin a fresh paragraph in my paper, and summarise three pages of evidence, of which the sentences immediately preceding are one subsidiary item.

His extract from my p. 356, still less represents my statement. I italicise the words which have been omitted:—

'The correspondence between Prof. Petrie's lithographs and my own may not be very striking, but I was fortunately able to travel direct from Heraklio to London, and so to see the two series of fragments within the same ten days, and I can only repeat that the two wares are almost identical.'

In the next paragraph Mr. Torr confronts me with Mr. Evans' account of the Dibaki find. His statement that Mr. Evans' book has no appendix is a verbal quibble. The book consists of a paper reprinted from the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, to which is appended the short paper which I cited. I cited it not 'in proof' of my statement (which is based on my own independent enquiries in Crete before Mr. Evans went there or Prof. Halbherr returned there), but as the only published account of the deposit besides that of Dr. Mariani to which I had already referred. I may of course have been misled by my informant; but even Mr. Evans' very cautious statement leaves it clear (1) that the deposit consisted of human bones associated with pottery and jewellery (2) that the evidence existed for assigning them to a XIIth Dynasty date, in the shape of XIIth Dynasty scarabs, and of native imitations of these (and of no other) Egyptian fabrics.

Again, on the recognition of XVIIIth and XIXth Dynasty fabrics among the porcelain objects on Mykenaeen sites, I quoted *J. H. S.* xii. p. 273 ff. (which should be p. 199 ff.) not as a complete statement, but as the best published discussion of the question. I am prepared to abide by the

statement both as to XVIIIth and as to XIXth Dynasty fabrics until Mr. Torr can prove to me a single contradictory instance.

On the origin of Queen Thii, my criticism was that Mr. Torr had committed either a logical fallacy or a grammatical confusion. His retort is to print my sentence halved, and adorned with italics of his own.

He gives as a last 'sample' of my archaeological work a passage where I wrote 'VIIIth century' (in *numerals*) and overlooked the printer's error 'VIIIth century.' Mr. Torr quotes this as 'seventh century' in *words* (a less probable misprint), and adds the passage from the *Times* article in which the year 700 is mentioned. A more candid critic would have added that the whole tenour of the *Times* article is to attribute the Mykenaeen necropolis at Kurion to a date below 700: and that 700 is the highest date specifically mentioned. Further, the statement in question has been frequently made to me lately by archaeologists of repute, whose names, for their own sakes, *ἐκὼν λήθομαι*. As before, I quoted the *Times* article as the best published version of the theory, for comparison with my own statement.

On the chronological question I thank Mr. Torr for the reference to Biot, which I had overlooked. With regard to Mahler's dating and the remainder of this section of the rejoinder I remain quite unconvinced. The fact that 'the Greeks always spoke of the Egyptian kings by the *nomen*' does not prove that the 'era of Menophres' was not known by the praenomen Men-peh-Ra to the Egyptian authorities from whom the Greeks knew it.

All that is claimed for 'dead-reckoning from the lists' is that it represents Egyptian tradition supplemented by certain collateral evidence: Mr. Torr's reckoning represents other collateral evidence supplemented by Egyptian tradition. The two disagree, but the former agrees more nearly than the latter with a set of astronomical data which many Egyptologists believe to be mainly trustworthy. On this ground the balance of probability is against Mr. Torr's reckoning, especially as Mr. Torr's dates are admittedly *minima*, whereas the dates from 'dead-reckoning' are by no means *maxima*.

Mr. Torr repudiates the genealogical part of his book; but when a writer fills page after page with statements that A, father of B, married C, daughter of D, and so forth, a reviewer may be pardoned if he thinks that a genealogy is intended. If he finds these statements, together with a

number of conjectural identifications of persons, and hypothetical reconstructions of Egyptian Dynastic history, inextricably mixed with an argument which claims to determine the relationship of kings to one another, and to reach a chronological result,

it is again natural to suppose that the genealogy is produced in support of the dates. I apologise for my mistake, and accept Mr. Torr's assurance that so much of his book is irrelevant.

J. L. MYRES.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

### Harvard Studies of Classical Philology. Vol. vi.

*The Opisthodomus on the Acropolis of Athens*, J. W. White. The writer argues (in opposition to the view of Milchhöfer, which is fully discussed) that the Opisthodomus was a separate building, and that it consisted of the three western chambers and the western portico which before the Persian war formed part of the Hecatompedon. *Artemis Anaitis and Mên Tiamu, a votive Tablet in the Boston Museum*, J. H. Wright. A tablet with inscriptions and three figures in relief, dedicated (for the recovery of a son from sickness) to Artemis Anaitis and Mên Tiamu. The characteristics of the latter deity (Mên), and his relations to Sabazius, are fully discussed, and it is conjectured that the word Tiamu means *καταθύμιος*. *The Date of Lycophron*, W. N. Bates. The dates arrived at are that Lycophron was born between 325 and 320, wrote the *Alexandra* about 295, was writing in the Alexandrian library 285, 284, and afterwards writing tragedies; and that his death must have occurred before 250 (on the assumption that the account of his death in the *Ibis* of Ovid was taken from the *Ibis* of Callimachus). *The Compounds of the verb iacio*, M. W. Mather. Discusses in all their parts the prosody and orthography of the various compounds of *iacio*. *Homeric quotations in Plato and Aristotle*, G. E. Howes. The quotations from Homeric poems in the writings of Plato and Aristotle are fully and carefully discussed with the especial view of gauging their value for textual criticism. He concludes that Plato's quotations, whether he quoted from memory or not, are to be carefully weighed, and not rejected merely because they vary from the traditional readings: similarly that, though there are passages where the presumption is that Aristotle quoted from memory and quoted wrongly, yet few of his variants can be summarily dismissed. At any rate in most cases where his quotations differ from the traditional text they probably give variants of high antiquity.

Vol. vii. (1896). *On the extent of the deliberate construction in relative clauses in Greek*, W. W. Goodwin. Discusses the views put forward by Mr. A. Sidgwick, Professor Tarbell, Dr. Earle, and Professor Gardner Hale in the *Classical Review* and in the *Transactions of the American Philological Association*. *Some features of the contrary to fact construction*, J. B. Greenough. A discussion of conditional sentences of the type 'si habeam dem,' 'si haberem darem,' with a suggestion (which surely could only hold good at most for orations and dialogue) that the construction was defined by tone of voice. *Studies in the text of Lucretius*, W. Everett. Observing (with cases in point) that Munro's text should not be accepted as a finality, he deals

especially with errors in the readings of Brieger, among them his reading in vi. 83 where 'nubisque ponenda' ends the line! On 'Os columnatum' and ancient instruments of confinement, F. D. Allen. An explanation (probably correct) of the 'os columnatum' in Plaut. *M. G.* 211. The passage is also made a peg on which to hang a very useful and thorough discussion of the various methods by which prisoners were fettered or pilloried in Greek and Roman gaols. *Cicero's journey into exile*, C. L. Smith. Discusses the dates of the various stages in his journey from evidence in the *Letters* and elsewhere. *Five interesting Greek imperatives*, J. H. Wright. A full discussion of the forms in vase inscriptions *πείε, δέχοι, δίδοι* (in which it is argued that the last letter is the demonstrative suffix -i, equivalent to the Latin -ce), *θίγες, πείε*. *The plot of the Agamemnon*, L. Dyer. Discusses the difficulties about the time in the play, rejecting Dr. Verrall's view. The arrogance and excesses of the Greeks permitted by Agamemnon in the sack of Troy are to meet with swift retribution, and by bringing the return of Agamemnon so near to the sack of Troy the poet marks the swiftness of the divine punishment: the audience is taken from the night of the destruction of Troy to the morning of Agamemnon's return. *Musonius the Etruscan*, C. P. Parker. An examination of all the evidence about the life and teaching of Musonius Rufus. The writer traces two persons, Musonius Rufus, the Etruscan, born about 25 A.D., who taught at Rome in Nero's reign and whose opinions appear both in Persius and Epictetus, and Musonius the Tyrian, living in a Greek city early in the second century, who is quoted by Stobaeus and is to be identified with Musonius 'the Babylonian' mentioned by Philostratus. *On the anapaests of Aeschylus*, H. W. Smyth. A classification of their metrical structure under the chief heads, *marching* and *melic anapaests*. *The dates of the exiles of Peisistratos*, H. N. Fowler. Argues that the dates derived from the text of 'Αἰ. ΠΟΛ. do not disagree with the chronology of Herodotus: an appendix on Iophon, the son of Peisistratos. *Coronelli's maps of Athens*, J. R. Wheeler. These seventeenth century maps (of which reproductions are given) are derived partly from Guillet, partly from Spon, partly from records of the Venetian siege. *Notes on Persius*, M. H. Morgan. *Notes on Suetonius*, A. A. Howard. *Varia Critica*, H. W. Hagley. (Contains a full discussion of the word *agino* in Petron. c. 61 and its kindred). *A point of order in Greek and Latin*, J. W. H. Walden. The reasons for the order and position of the copula. *Omens and augury in Plautus*, C. B. Gulick. Among other terms which are discussed, *in mundo* is explained as 'on the augural horizon,' therefore 'foredoomed' or 'ready.'

THE following slight correction in my article of last month on Pylos and Sphacteria was too late to be made in proof.

p. 3 note 8. *J.H.S.* p. 67 should be *J.H.S.* p. 64. The similar walls referred to

on p. 67 are on the North of Pylos. On that page, note 42, the word 'polygonal' should be deleted.

RONALD M. BURROWS.

## LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

### ENGLISH AND AMERICAN BOOKS.

- Boissier* (Gaston.) The country of Horace and Virgil, translated by D. H. Fisher. 8vo. 11, 346 pp. New York, Putnams. \$1.
- Book of Judges in Greek, according to the text of Codex Alexandrinus. Edited by A. E. Brooke and N. McLean. Crown 8vo. Cambridge Univ. Press. 2s. 6d.
- Caesar*. History of the Helvetian War: de bello Gallico I., 1-29. With notes and vocabulary by E. S. Shuckburgh. 12mo. 96 pp. Cambridge Univ. Press. 1s. 6d.
- the same with notes and vocabulary by A. H. Allcroft and F. G. Plaistowe. Crown 8vo. 76 pp. Clive 1s. 6d.
- Gardner* (E. A.) Handbook of Greek sculpture. Crown 8vo. 588 pp. Macmillan. 10s.
- Hatch* (E.) and H. A. Redpath. Concordance to the Septuagint and the other Greek versions of the Old Testament including the Apocryphal Books. Part 6. 4to. Frowde. £1 1s.
- Herodotus*. The text. Canon Rawlinson's translation; notes abridged by A. J. Grant. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 888 pp., maps, plans. Murray. 12s.
- Holm* (A.) The history of Greece. Translated from the German. (4 vols.) Vol. III. 8vo. 470 pp. Macmillan 6s. net.
- Hunter* (W. A.) Roman Law and the Institutes of Justinian. Introduction to the study. Fifth Edition. Crown 8vo. Sweet & M. 7s. 6d.
- Morris* (W. H.) Greek lessons. Thirteenth Edition. Parts I. II. in 1 vol. 16mo. 138 pp. Longmans. 3s.
- Moulton* (F. P.) Preparatory Latin composition, with collaboration by W. C. Cellar. 12mo. 13, 142 pp. Boston, Ginn. 90 cts.
- Smith* (Sir W.) Smaller History of Greece, new edition, revised by G. E. Marindin. Crown 8vo. 282 pp., coloured maps, plans, engravings. Murray. 3s. 6d.
- Suetonius*. Stories of the Caesars. Selections from the lives of Julius and Augustus. With notes and vocabulary by H. Wilkinson. 18mo. 138 pp. Macmillan. 1s. 6d.
- Tarbell* (F. B.) History of Greek Art. With introductory chapter on art in Egypt and Mesopotamia. Crown 8vo. 296 pp. Macmillan. 6s.
- Vergilius*. Eneid, Book I. With introduction, notes, and vocabulary by A. H. Allcroft and W. E. Masom. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. Clive. 3s.
- Vergilius*. The Eclogues, translated into English hexameter verse by Sir G. E. Osbourne Morgan. 4to. 64 pp. Frowde. 4s. 6d. net.
- White* (J. W.) The first Greek book. Square 16mo. 5, 62 pp. Boston, Ginn. \$1. 35.
- Zeller* (E.) Aristotle and the earlier Peripatetics, translated from 'Philosophy of the Greeks' by B. F. C. Costelloe and J. H. Muirhead. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 1054 pp. Longmans. £1 4s.

### FOREIGN BOOKS.

- Aeschylus*. Plüss (T.) Die Tragödie Agamemnon und das Tragische. 4to. 40 pp. Basel.
- Preuss (A.) De versuum iambicorum in melicis partibus usui Aeschyleo. 8vo. 118 pp. Leipzig, Gräfe. 2 Mk. 50.
- Anthologia latina sive poesis latinae supplementum*, ed. Franc. Buecheler et A. Riese. Pars II. Carmina latina epigraphica, conlegit F. Buecheler. Fasc. II. 8vo. pp. 399-921. Leipzig, Teubner. 5 Mk. 20.
- Aristophanes*. Römer (A.) Zur Kritik und Exegese der Wolken des Aristophanes. 8vo. 36 pp. München.
- Arndt* (W.) Schrifttafeln zur Erlernung der lateinischen Palaeographie. Pt. 1. Third Edition, by M. Tangl. Folio. 9 pp., 30 plates. Berlin, Grote. 15 Mk.
- Barth* (H.) De Coorum titulorum dialecto. 8vo. vi, 125 pp. Basel.
- Beloch* (Jul.) Griechische Geschichte. Vol. II. (Bis auf Aristoteles und die Eroberung Asiens.) 8vo. 13, 713 pp., 1 map. Strassburg, Trübner. 9 Mk.
- Borchardt* (L.) Bericht über den baulichen Zustand der Tempelbauten auf Philae. 8vo. 17 pp., engravings. Berlin.
- Bräunel* (J.) Beitrag zu einer Parallelgrammatik des Deutschen, Griechischen und Lateinischen. 8vo. 80 pp. Arnau.
- Caesar's Bellum Gallicum*. Textausgabe für den Schulgebrauch von T. H. Schmalz. 12mo. xx, 248 pp., 1 plate, 1 map. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk. 20.
- Commentarii cum A. Hirtii aliorumque supplementis ex rec. B. Kübleri. Vol. III., p. i. Commentarius de bello Alexandrino, rec. B. Kübler. Commentarius de bello Africo, rec. E. Wölfflin. 12mo. xlv, 104 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk.
- Cecaueni Strategicon et incerti scriptoris de officiis regis libellus*. Ediderunt B. Wassiliewsky, V. Jernstedt. 8vo. 113 pp., 1 plate. St. Petersburg, Hoenniger. 3 Mk.

- Cicero*. Brandt (S.) *Ad Ciceronis de re publica libros adnotationes*. 4to. 10 pp. Heidelberg.
- Critias*. Patrick (H. N.) *De Critiae operibus. Pedestri oratione conscriptis*. 8vo. 56 pp. Jena.
- Cybulski* (Steph.) *Tabulae, quibus antiquitates graecae et romanae illustrantur*. Nr. 16. The Greek House. Erklärender text. 8vo. 18 pp., engravings. Leipzig, Köhler's Baarsort. 40 Pf.
- Demosthenes' neun Philippische Reden. Textausgabe für den Schulgebrauch von Th. Thalheim. 8vo. xiv, 144 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk.
- Schefczik (H.) *Ueber die Abfassungszeit der ersten philippischen Rede des Demosthenes*. 8vo. 29 pp. Troppau.
- Dio Chrysostomus*. Hahn (K.) *De Dionis Chrysostomi rationibus, quae inscribuntur Diogenes*. 8vo. 73 pp. Göttingen.
- Fegerl* (J.) *Die physikalischen Kenntnisse der Alten, entnommen den wichtigsten Stellen der Autoren*. 8vo. 34 pp. Mähr. Neustadt.
- Fischbach* (O.) *Silbermünzen der römischen Republik aus Steiermark*. 8vo. 16 pp., 2 engravings. Graz.
- Gilbert* (Gust.) *Beiträge zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des griechischen Gerichtsverfahrens und des griechischen Rechtes*. (Aus 'Jahrbücher für class. Philol. Suppl. vol. 23.') 8vo. 96 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 3 Mk. 60.
- Goutmy* (E.) *Le Parthénon et le génie grec*. 12mo. xxxv, 303 pp., plate. Paris, Colin.
- Handbuch der klassischen Alterthumswissenschaft von I. von Müller. Halbband 22 und 23. (Atlas zu Vol. VI. Archaeologie der Kunst von K. Sittl.) Oblong folio. 64 plates, containing 1,000 engravings, 28 pp. (Indices.) München, Beck. 13 Mk. 50.
- Heberdey* (Rud.) und *Ad. Wilhelm*, *Reisen in Kilikien, ausgeführt 1891 und 1892 im Auftrag der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften*. 4to. 168 pp., engravings, map (by H. Kiepert.) (Aus *Denkschriften der K. Akademie der Wiss.*) Wien, Gerold. 13 Mk. 70.
- Heraclides*. Voss (O.) *De Heraclides Pontici vita et scriptis*. 8vo. 95 pp. Rostock.
- Holder* (Alfr.) *Altceltischer Sprachschatz*. Part 9. (Vol. II., Col. 1-256.) 8vo. Leipzig, Teubner. 8 Mk.
- Holm* (Ad.), W. Deecke, W. Soltan, *Kulturgeschichte des Klassischen Alterthums*. (Sonderabdruck aus *Hellwald's Kulturgeschichte*, Fourth Edition. Vol. II.) Royal 8vo. xii, 594 pp., 318 engravings, 7 plates, 2 maps. Leipzig, Friesenhahn. 10 Mk.
- Homerus*. Molhuysen (P. C.) *de tribus Homeri Odysseae codicibus antiquissimis*. 8vo. 154 pp., 5 plates. Leiden, Sijthoff. 4 Mk. 20.
- Zühl (T.) *De Amesii quae vulgo dicitur in Iliade et Odyssea Homeri*. 8vo. 33 pp. Baden.
- Homoly* (M.) *Statue de bronze découverte à Delphes*. 8vo. 27 pp., 4 plates. Paris, Imprim. Nation.
- Horatius*. Hawrlant (F.) *Horaz als Freund der Natur nach seinen Gedichten*. II. Theil. 8vo. 26 pp. Landskron.
- Raiz (A.) *Die Frage nach der Anordnung der Horazischen Oden. Eine kritische Uebersicht*. 8vo. 14 pp. Graz.
- Wagner (J.) *Collation einer Horazhandschrift aus dem 12. Jahrhundert*. 8vo. 58 pp. Kalksburg.
- Huemer* (C.) *Die Sage von Orest in der tragischen Dichtung*. 8vo. 34 pp. Linz.
- Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der klassischen Alterthumswissenschaft, begründet von C. Bursian, herausgegeben von I. v. Müller. Vol. 87. Supplementary Volume, Final Part (4-6): Jahresbericht über die griechische Epigraphik für 1888-1894. von W. Larfeld. 8vo. III pp. and pp. 289-495. Berlin, Calvary. 8 Mk. 40.
- Joannes Antiochenus*. Rüger (A.) *Präpositionen bei Johannes Antiochus*. I. Teil. 8vo. 38 pp. Münsterstadt.
- Josephus* (Flavius.) *Antiquitatum iudaicarum epitoma*, ed. Ben. Niese. 4to. x, 369 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 15 Mk.
- Drüner (H.) *Untersuchungen über Josephus*. 8vo. 94 pp. Marburg.
- Juvenalis*. Höhler (W.) *Die Cornutus-Scholien zum I. Buch der Satiren Juvenals*. (Aus *Jahrbücher für class. Philol. Suppl. Vol. 23.*) 8vo. 63 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk. 40.
- Kluge* (H.) *Die Schrift der Mykenier. Eine Untersuchung über System und Lautwerth der von A. J. Evans entdeckten vorphönizischen Schriftzeichen*. 8vo. 8, 110 pp., 4 plates and 80 engravings. Cöthen, Schulze. 8 Mk.
- Köhler* (U.) *Zur Geschichte des athenischen Münzwesens*. 8vo. 9 pp., 1 plate. Berlin.
- Kubitschek* (J. W.) *Rundschau über das letzterflossene Quinquennium der antiken Numismatik*. (1890-1894.) 8vo. 62 pp. Wien.
- Lactantius*. Knappitsch (A.) *De L. Caeli Firmiani Lactanti 'ave Phoenix'*. 8vo. 39 pp. Graz.
- Larfeld* (W.) *Bericht über die griechische Epigraphik für 1888-1894*. (Aus *Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der class. Alterthumswissenschaft*.) 8vo. 371 pp. Berlin. 12 Mk.
- Le Blant* (E.) *Sept cent cinquante inscriptions de pierres gravées inédites ou peu connues*. 4to. 214 pp., 2 plates. Paris, Klincksieck.
- Limes* (der obergermanisch-rätische) des Römerreichs. Herausgegeben von O. v. Sarwey und F. Hettner. Part IV. 4to. 6, 9, 7, 10 pp., engravings, 7 plates, map. Heidelberg, Petters. 3 Mk. 60.
- Linden* (E.) *De bello civili Sullano*. 8vo. 68 pp. Freiburg.
- Lindskog* (C.) *Quaestiones de paratati et hypotaxi apud prisca latinos*. 8vo. iv, 95 pp. Lund.
- Lucretius Carus*, de rerum natura Buch III. erklärt von Rich. Heinze. 8vo. vi, 206 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 4 Mk.
- Meurer* (M.) *Die Ursprungsformen des griechischen Akanthus-Ornaments und ihre natürlichen Vorbilder*. Royal 8vo. iv, 43 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 1 Mk. 60.
- Meyer* (Gust.) *Griechische Grammatik*. Third Edition. 8vo. xviii, 715 pp. Leipzig, Breitkopf und H. 13 Mk.
- Oblak* (V.) *Macedonische Studien*. Nach dem Tode des Verfassers im Drucke besorgt und mit einem Anhang versehen von V. Jagić. 8vo. 156 pp. Wien.
- Ott* (Ludw.) *Beiträge zur Kenntniss des griechischen Eides*. 8vo. 153 pp. Leipzig, Fock. 2 Mk.
- Pervice* (E.) *Griechisches Pferdegeschirr im Antiquarium der kgl. Museen in Berlin*. (56. Winckelmannprogramm.) 4to. 36 pp., 23 engravings, 3 plates. Berlin, Reimer. 4 Mk.
- Philodemos*. Perron (H.) *Textkritische Bemerkungen zu Philodemos' Oeconomicus*. 8vo. 85 pp. Zürich.
- Plants* (R. v.) *Grammatik der oskisch-umbrischen Dialecte*. Vol. II. Formenlehre, Syntax. Sammlung der Inschriften, Glossen. Anhang. Glossar. 8vo. xv, 772 pp. Strassburg, Trübner. 20 Mk.
- Plato*. *Opera omnia rec. et commentariis instr.* God. Stallbaum. Vol. VIII., Sectio II. Sophista. Ed. II. rec., prolegomenis et commentariis instr. O. Apelt. 8vo. viii, 217 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 5 Mk. 60.